

**The Mirror-for-Princesses:
The Fashioning of English Queenship
1553-1603**

May-Shine Lin

For the degree of PhD.
The University of Edinburgh
2000

Abstract

This is a study about self-identity and self-fashioning within a Renaissance cultural context, focusing on the first two English queen regnants, Elizabeth I and Mary I. In modern scholarship, discussion of the English female monarchy in the sixteenth century has centred predominantly on the reign of Elizabeth. This thesis attempts to reshape the existing understanding of Elizabeth's reign by a comparison between Elizabeth and her half-sister, Mary. The comparison draws on two distinct sources: first, the queens' speeches, letters and practices; second, the texts classed as "mirror-for-princesses," which were written to advise the queens' governance, as the counterpart to the "mirror-for-princes," a guideline for Renaissance princes. The use of these sources is justified by my conviction that both the queens themselves and the writers of "mirror-for-princesses" formed a crucial part in fashioning the English people's perception of the queens' rule from 1553 to 1603. Divided into three parts, this thesis focuses on three specific issues engendered by the queens' rule: the cultivation of queenly virtues, the legitimacy of the queens' government and lastly their marriage. I shall suggest a notable continuity between these two queens, despite the obvious disjunction of their religion, since both Elizabeth and Mary faced similar tensions and a similar dilemma regarding female rule. I argue further for a greater recognition of Queen Mary's influence on Elizabeth. Elizabeth benefited from Mary's accomplishments in legalising the female monarchy and learned from Mary's self-representation, either in imitating her rhetoric or avoiding her mistakes, and was therefore not so inventive in styling her rule as we have usually assumed. With respect to the works of "mirror-for-princesses" in both reigns, this thesis proposes that the writers did not always advise the queens in accordance with the queens' image-making and policies. They occasionally challenged the queens' self-representation, particularly in the reign of Elizabeth. The myth that Elizabeth was definitely more powerful than Mary does not hold, because, as the comparison with Mary shows, Elizabeth likewise showed weakness and incompetence.

I hereby affirm that this thesis is my own work, and has been composed by me solely.

Singed:

May-Shine Lin

Contents

List of Illustrations	vi
Acknowledgements	vii
Abbreviations	viii
 Introduction	 1
 Part One The Cultivation of Queenly Virtues	
 Chapter 1 Queen Mary: the Centrality of Womanly Virtues	 22
I. The ideal picture of queenly virtues	28
II. Queen Mary's cultivation of womanly virtues	44
III. Fashioning the godly Queen and mother	69
 Chapter 2 Queen Elizabeth: the Representation of Princely Virtues	 85
I. The representations of Elizabeth's virtues	91
II. The fusing of male and female identities	104
III. The master of princely virtues	117
IV. The mirror for the Queen's princely virtues	131
 Part Two The Legitimacy of the Queen's Rule	
 Chapter 3 Mary's Rule and Obedience to the Female Monarchy	 155
I. The Queen's legitimacy	159
II. The paradigm of joint rule	167
III. The Act for the queen's regal power	174
IV. Obedience and disobedience to the female monarchy	182

Chapter 4 Elizabeth's Rule and the Legitimacy of Gynecocracy	202
I. The ruling queens' coronation entries	209
II. Elizabeth's "Entry" of Power	217
III. The Protestant defence of the queen's rule	229
IV. The defence of the queen's rule after 1570	246
 Part Three The Advice on the Queen's Marriage	
 Chapter 5 Mary's Spanish Match and English Patriotism	271
I. The Queen's will and her free choice	276
II. The Queen and the people's will	290
III. The defence of the Queen's choice	299
IV. The demonstration of the English patriotism	305
 Chapter 6 Elizabeth's French Alliance and England's Independence	318
I. A perpetual virgin?	318
II. The words of a prince	324
III. The French courtship in 1579	338
IV. The apology for England's national independence	345
V. The Queen's defence and the end of the French courtship	360
 Conclusion	375
Appendix	394
Bibliography	396

List of Illustrations

1. Albrecht Dürer, <i>The Virgin on the Crescent</i> .	80
2. <i>Mary I</i> , the first Plea Roll portrait of Mary for Michaelmas, 1553.	81
3. <i>Philip and Mary enthroned, beneath a canopy with windows above</i> . Illuminated Plea Roll initial, Michaelmas, 1554.	82
4. <i>Great Seal of Philip and Mary</i> .	83
5. Frans Huys, <i>Portrait of Mary Tudor</i> , c. 1554, with her motto “Veritas Temporis Filia.” under the portrait.	84
6. Elizabeth I as Emperor Constantine, from John Foxe, <i>Actes and Monuments</i> (1563).	152
7. Elizabeth I as King Solomon, from Thomas Morton, <i>Salomon or a Treatise Declaring the State of the Kingdome of Israel</i> (1596).	153

Acknowledgements

My research was greatly facilitated by the regular talkings with my first supervisor Dr. Richard Mackenney. His broad knowledge of Renaissance society, and his speciality in Italian culture and in the works of “mirror-for-princes,” stimulated the theme of “mirror-for-princesses” in this thesis. This study is also indebted to my other two supervisors, Dr. Adam Fox and Dr. David Howarth. Their knowledge of Tudor England and Renaissance representations have been tremendously influential in constructing my research and writing. All my three supervisors have given me endless tactful encouragement during these years. In addition to their intellectual stimulus, I must give special thanks to them for their particular patience and kindness in guiding a student from the Far East.

I could not have asked for better examiners than Professor Wallace MacCaffrey and Professor Anthony Goodman. As the world’s leading scholar on Queen Elizabeth I, Professor MacCaffrey, with his profound knowledge enlightened and inspired me further in approaching this attractive *Gloriana*. Professor Goodman generously shared with me his insights on late Medieval England and humanist education, providing a broader background to which my study cannot do full justice. I am deeply grateful for their warm encouragement to continue in this area in the future.

I wish to extend my appreciation to Taiwan Government Scholarship which funds my research and supports my living here. I would also like to thank the helpful and friendly assistance of those librarians in the National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh University Library, British Library and Houghton Library in Harvard University. Furthermore, several friends deserve my special thanks for they not only read my numerous early drafts, but also give me invaluable generosity and friendship. They are Sarah Macpherson, Carla Landon, Carol Rennie and Frances Weightman. Finally, my family and fiancé have been amazingly supportive during these years. My gratitude to them is beyond words.

Abbreviations

<i>CSP For.</i>	<i>Calendar of State Papers, foreign series, of the reign of Mary, 1553-1558.</i> Ed. William B. Turnbull (London: Longman, 1861).
<i>CSP Foreign</i>	<i>Calendar of State Papers, foreign series, of the reign of Elizabeth, 1579-1580.</i> Ed. Arthur John Butler (London: HMSO, 1904).
<i>CSP Sp.</i>	<i>Calendar of Letters, Despatches and State Papers relating to the negotiations between England and Spain,</i> vols. XI-XIII. Ed. Royal Tyler (London, 1916-54).
<i>CSP Spain</i>	<i>Calendar of Letters, Despatches, and State Papers relating to English Affairs,</i> 4 vols. Ed. Martin A. S. Hume (London: HMSO, 1892-1899).
<i>CSP Ven.</i>	<i>Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts Relating to English Affairs existing in the archives and collections of Venice,</i> 38 vols. Ed. Rawdon Brown (London: HMSO, 1864-1974).
Foxe	John Foxe, <i>Acts and Monuments</i> , 8 vols. Ed. George Townsend (New York: AMS Press, 1965).
Harrison	<i>The Letters of Queen Elizabeth I.</i> Ed. G. B. Harrison (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1968).
<i>Parliaments</i>	<i>Proceedings in the Parliaments of Elizabeth I,</i> 3 vols. Ed. T. E. Hartley (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1981-1995).
<i>Queen Jane and Queen Mary</i>	<i>The Chronicle of Queen Jane and Two Years of Queen Mary.</i> Ed J. G. Nichols (Camden Society, os, LIII, 1852).
<i>STC</i>	<i>A Short Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, and Ireland, 1475-1640,</i> 3 vols. Eds. A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave (London, 1969).
<i>Tudor Royal Proclamations</i>	<i>Tudor Royal Proclamations,</i> 3 vols. Eds. Paul L. Hughes and James F. Larkin (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964).
Strype	John Strype, <i>Ecclesiastical Memorials</i> , 3 vols. (Oxford, 1822).

Introduction

i. Two contrary queens?

On 17 November 1587, Isaac Colfe preached a sermon in Kent in which he reviewed the benefits brought by Queen Elizabeth to the English people since she succeeded to the throne on 17 November 1558:

Queen Mary left it vexed with the insolency of the Spanish nation which she brought in, Queen Elizabeth hath eased it; Mary left it in war, Elizabeth hath governed it in peace; Mary left it in debt, Elizabeth hath enriched it; Mary left it weak, Elizabeth hath strengthened it; nay further, wherein the perfection of our present happiness consisteth, Mary banishes true religion, Elizabeth hath restored it; Mary persecuted it, Elizabeth hath defended it; Mary cast it down, Elizabeth hath advanced it. Mary with the intollerable superstitions of Antechrist, defiled it, Elizabeth by casting them out, hath purged it: so that now with liberty of body we enioy freedome of conscience, in stead of being strangers in other lands.¹

Colfe's point of view makes a clear-cut differentiation between the reigns of Queen Mary and Queen Elizabeth, as the polarities of darkness and light, evil and justice. This view—that Elizabeth's accession ushered in a new and better age, in contrast with Mary's brutal persecution—was proclaimed across Protestant literature.

One of its earliest and most celebrated expressions was by the Marian exile John Foxe who comments in his *Acts and Monuments* (1563) that Mary's rule had procured an unprecedented cruelty in English history, "by hanging, beheading, burning, and prisoning, so much christian blood, so many Englishmen's lives, were

¹ Isaac Colfe, *A Sermon Preached on the Queenes Day, being the 17 of Nouember, 1587 at the towne of Lidd in Kent* (London: J. Wolfe, 1588, STC 5552), sig. 8r-v.

spilled within this realm.”² As the new era dawned with the reign of Queen Elizabeth, Foxe proclaims that

Now we see things done with more advisement and less haste, no man now presuming to violate orders godly taken, or to stir the people to change what they list, before order be published by law. And as we have seen the coming in, the proceeding, and the ending, of the one, so let us compare, withal, the conditions of the other. She [Elizabeth] cometh in like a mother, not like a step-dame; like a lamb, not like a lion; she rusheth not in to hand and draw; her majesty beheadeth none, burneth none, spoileth none, forgiveth all.³

For Foxe, the contrast between these half-sisters is overt: Elizabeth is the natural and loving mother, while Mary is a villainous and ferocious step-mother. Foxe’s view of history and his eulogy for Elizabeth, together with many other Protestant texts, not only darkened Mary’s rule, but also created a discourse about the uniqueness of Elizabeth’s reign. Moreover, they established an enduring myth, claiming that the Elizabethan age was a different era and a new beginning.⁴ This myth, impressively, was transmitted from Elizabethan historiography to the modern generation of English historians.

G. R. Elton in his *England under the Tudors* (1974) supports Foxe’s idea in his judgement of Mary’s reign as a complete ruin, “positive achievements there were none,” and Mary’s life “was one of almost unrelieved tragedy.” Elton expresses

² Foxe, VIII, 625.

³ Ibid., 601-02.

⁴ Roy Strong, *The Cult of Elizabeth: Elizabethan Portraiture and Pageantry* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1977), 128. Foxe’s work was one of the most popular books in early modern England. It was originally written in Latin in 1554 and its first English version was printed in 1563, then was revised and enlarged in 1570, 1576, and 1583, and went through subsequent editions in 1596, 1610, 1625, and 1632. In addition, it was installed in every cathedral church from 1571 by official order. It was the most influential book in Elizabethan England, next to the Bible.

great relief as he narrates the accession of Elizabeth, “the real saving of England lay simply in the fact that Edward died young and Mary ruled for only five years. Good government came back in the nick of time.” It looks as if Elizabeth, “the natural-born queen,” turned the wheel of England’s fortune and established a female monarchy distinct from Mary’s.⁵ Present Tudor historians, to a greater or lesser extent, still maintain the peculiarity of Elizabeth’s reign and are keen on the contrast between Mary’s weakness and Elizabeth’s greatness. Penry Williams, for instance, stresses that the contrast between these two queens is “striking.”⁶ Even John Guy, more aware of the artificial myth created by John Foxe and other Protestants, still emphasises the remarkable dissimilarity between Mary and Elizabeth.⁷

Mary and Elizabeth were indeed very different. However, the stereotype of Mary’s disgrace and Elizabeth’s glory results to a great degree from the bias of Elizabethan propaganda. In fact Mary and Elizabeth had much in common in their education and in their unpleasant experiences before their accession to the throne, and more importantly, they suffered the common disadvantage of being female ruler. Both had to build a female monarchy unprecedented in English history, and so without any adequate role model.⁸ Each also had to rule around society’s traditional

⁵ G. R. Elton, *England under the Tudors* (London: Methuen, 1974), 214, 222, 262.

⁶ Penry Williams, *The Later Tudors, England 1547-1603* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 229.

⁷ John Guy, *Tudor England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 227. Another Tudor historian, Alan G. R. Smith, however, suggests that Mary’s weakness and ineffectiveness should not be exaggerated. See his *The Emergence of a Nation State: the Commonwealth of England 1529-1660* (London: Longman, 1984), 86.

⁸ The only precedent of female rule in England was the Empress Matilda (1102-1167), an unsuccessful model. Matilda was Henry I’s only surviving legitimate child, who had made valiant but futile efforts in 1135 to prevent her first cousin, Stephen, the son of her father’s sister, from becoming monarch in her stead. The claim of the Empress Matilda was so discounted that at the end

constructions of the female sex and often rule in the face of people's defiance. In various respects, therefore, they confronted the same challenges and needed to employ similar resources to resolve the problems of female rule. This thesis springs from the conviction that historians have overestimated the distinctions between these two queen regnants and have neglected their common struggle with several identical issues and difficulties in terms of female rule. Primarily, the reign of Elizabeth should not be treated as *de novo*, since the problems of the queen's rule, as well as some other political issues, had arisen and developed through Queen Mary's reign and were inherited by her younger sister.

ii. Ruling queens and the culture of fashioning

This is not a study of high politics, factions, military affairs, religious controversies or a biography of individual queens. Instead, this thesis will focus on a cultural dimension, concerning the image-making, self-fashioning and self-identity of two English Renaissance queens. In fact, it will look at two different but closely related political performances. The significance of self-fashioning or self-presentation has been signalled as a remarkable phenomenon of Renaissance culture by several scholars from Jacob Burckhard's *Civilisation of the Renaissance in Italy*

of his reign, Stephen had been able to recognise as his heir, her son, Henry of Anjou, who became king during her lifetime. See Marjorie Chibnall, *The Empress Matilda, Consort, Queen Mother and Lady of the English* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991). One possible contemporary English role model of a woman in power was Katherine Parr, who acted as a regent in 1544 when Henry VIII campaigned in Flanders. However, her regency was short and lacked any obvious influence on the performances of the prospective Tudor queen regnants.

in 1860 to present-day scholars such as Peter Burke and Stephen Greenblatt.⁹ Renaissance society, especially in Italy, is described as a “theatre society” where “if you don’t show off, you are dead.”¹⁰ People, from high to low, it is argued, consciously fashioned themselves through delicate expressions and gestures in order to give positive impressions of themselves.

Abundant terms have referred to this theatrical consciousness, such as self-discipline, self-control, self-knowledge, self-cultivation, self-presentation, self-fashioning; there is also a multiple terminology which described this performance as dissimulation, disguise, feigning, fabrication and masking. Ultimately, they all describe a process of self-perception and the presentation of self to others, which Renaissance people believed they could and should manipulate. However, there was not a single pattern of self-fashioning; instead, as Peter Burke suggests, there exists a variety of selves and of self-presentations.¹¹ Men and women, courtiers and soldiers, patricians and plebeians, Catholics and Protestants, might develop their own styles of self-representation. Nevertheless, it is argued that the degree of the necessity for self-fashioning differed for various classes of people. Those people who encountered profound social mobility or who experienced ambiguity of identity would suffer the most anxiety regarding self-identity and self-presentation. This

⁹ Jacob Burckhardt, *The Civilisation of the Renaissance in Italy*, trans. S. G. C. Millemore (London: C. K. Paul, 1978); Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (Chicago: the University of Chicago Press, 1984); Peter Burke, *The Historical Anthropology of Early Modern Italy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

¹⁰ Peter Burke, *The Historical Anthropology*, 10, 12.

¹¹ Peter Burke, “Representations of the Self from Petrarch to Descartes,” in *Rewriting the Self: Histories from the Renaissance to the Present*, ed. Roy Porter (London: Routledge, 1997), 27.

was just the situation for Renaissance queens in power, such as Isabella of Castile, who reigned from 1474 to 1504, and Catherine de Medici, who acted as a queen regent for her three sons from 1559 to 1589 in France.¹²

The existence of influential women was not really a rare or unacceptable phenomenon in sixteenth-century society. As Barbara J. Harris indicates: “none of the extant sources suggests that men thought there was anything unusual or unseemly about female activity in this area.”¹³ Indeed, more and more studies have highlighted that the extent of women’s influence on their husbands in domestic affairs, and that of some noblewomen on political and cultural spheres through their patronage or the networks of kinship, are too significant to ignore.¹⁴ Nevertheless, it did not mean that female rule was accepted without questioning, even though some women wielded practical influence through informal channels, such as patronage and family networks. Those queen regnants who could attain the throne by their own right and hold political power within the institution of monarchy generated considerable distrust and ambivalence, due to the widespread preference for male rule in particular and a presumption of male supremacy in general. The queen

¹² For both queens’ self-fashioning, see Marvin Lunenfeld, “Isabella I of Castile and the Company of Women in Power,” *Historical Reflections* 4-2 (1977): 207-29 and Sheila Ffolliott, “Catherine de’ Medici as Artemisia: Figuring the Powerful Widow,” in *Rewriting the Renaissance: the Discourse of Sexual Difference in Early Modern Europe*, eds. Margaret W. Ferguson, Maureen Quilligan and Nancy J. Vickers (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), 227-41. For more sixteenth-century queens in power, see Lisa Hopkins, *Women Who Would be Kings: Female Rulers of the Sixteenth Century* (London, New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1991).

¹³ Barbara J. Harris, “Women and Politics in Early Tudor England,” *The Historical Journal* 33-2 (1990): 260.

¹⁴ See Harris, “Women and Politics in Early Tudor England,” 259-81; Sharon Kettering “The Patronage Power of Early Modern French Noblewomen,” *The Historical Journal* 32-4 (1989): 817-41; Roland H. Bainton, “The Role of Noblewomen in the French Reformation,” *Archive for Reformation History* 63 (1972): 168-94; Magdalena S Sánchez, *The Empress, the Queen, and the Nun, Women and Power at the Court of Philip III of Spain* (Baltimore: the Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998).

regnants, therefore, were more anxious than other members of society to establish an identity for themselves, and faced more pressure regarding self-realisation and self-defence because of the ambiguity of their roles.

In recent decades, there have been voluminous studies specifically devoted to the representation and self-fashioning of Queen Elizabeth, including Frances Yates (1947), Roy Strong (1963 and 1977), Allison Heisch (1975), John King (1990), Susan Frye (1993), Carole Levin (1994), Helen Hackett (1995).¹⁵ Elizabeth's skilful technique of self-fashioning and her political rhetoric are viewed as unique and innovative to her reign and her reign itself has been perceived as a new beginning by many historians. In contrast, Mary's art of self-presentation has been greatly neglected and underestimated by most historians, except Judith M. Richards who gives Mary more credit in styling the English female monarchy.¹⁶ This thesis intends to break the hegemony of the study of Elizabeth's image-making, for her female rule is neither sole nor unique. Instead, Elizabeth's strategy of ruling and fashioning should be juxtaposed with Mary's and viewed within the Renaissance context of the queen's rule and the self-fashioning culture.

¹⁵ Frances A. Yates, "Queen Elizabeth as Astraea," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 10 (1947): 27-82; Roy Strong, *Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963) and *The Cult of Elizabeth*; Allison Heisch, "Queen Elizabeth I: Parliamentary Rhetoric and the Exercise of Power," *Signs* 1-1 (1975): 31-55; John King, "Queen Elizabeth I: Representations of the Virgin Queen," *Renaissance Quarterly* 43 (1990): 30-74; Susan Frye, *Elizabeth I: The Competition for Representation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993); Carole Levin, *The Heart and Stomach of a King: Elizabeth I and the Politics of Sex and Power* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994); Helen Hackett, *Virgin Mother, Maiden Queen: Elizabeth I and the Cult of the Virgin Mary* (London: Macmillan, 1995).

¹⁶ Judith M. Richards, "Mary Tudor as 'sole quene'? Gendering Tudor Monarchy," *The Historical Journal* 40-4 (1997): 895-924.

iii. Who fashioned English queenship?

The self-identity and self-perception of both Tudor queens was moulded by a humanist education in their early years. The humanist learning of Tudor noblewomen can be traced back to Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond and mother of Henry VII. Its heyday, however, came after the accession of Henry VIII, especially under the patronage of Catherine of Aragon, Mary's mother. Catherine, deeply concerned about her only daughter's education, commissioned humanists to present writings about women's upbringing. Consequently, Juan Luis Vives dedicated his *De institutione foeminae christianae*—the leading educational manual of women's education in the sixteenth century—to her in 1523 as well as writing *De ratione studii puerilis*, a study plan specifically for the education of Mary, in the same year. In addition, Catherine formed a court school for noblewomen around Princess Mary.¹⁷

Princess Mary, under the intense care of her mother as well as her father, had become a woman comprehensively educated in the humanist tradition before Princess Elizabeth entered the world of classical authors. Mary was excellent in Latin and capable of reading the works of Thomas More and Erasmus in the original; she even translated a Latin prayer of St. Thomas Aquinas. Henry Parker, Lord Morley, recalled that “I do well remember that scant ye were come to twelve years of age but

¹⁷ See John E. Paul, *Catherine of Aragon and Her Friends* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1966); Maria Dowling, “A Woman's Place? Learning and the Wives of Henry VIII,” *History Today* 41 (1991): 38-42 and her “Humanist Support for Katherine of Aragon,” *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 57 (1984): 46-55.

that ye were so ripe in the Latin tongue, that rare doth happen to the woman sex.”¹⁸

Besides Latin, Mary was competent in French and Spanish and also understood Castilian and Italian; she was praised by a number of ambassadors for her competence in these tongues.¹⁹

Princess Elizabeth, similarly, had a meticulous training in the humanist curriculum. She recalled her education in her speech at Oxford in 1566, stating that “Certainly, I confess that my parents took the most diligent care that I should be properly instructed in the liberal arts. And, indeed, I was for a long time engaged in the study of a variety of many tongues, of which I assume I have some knowledge. . . . Certainly, I have had many learned teachers who laboured diligently to make me erudite.”²⁰ Despite the mention of her mother’s care, Elizabeth’s humanist learning was supported mainly by the energies of Katherine Parr, Henry VIII’s sixth wife, who revived the tradition of Catherine of Aragon’s court school.²¹

¹⁸ Cited in Maria Dowling, *Humanism in the Age of Henry VIII* (London: Croom Helm, 1986), 228. For more about Tudor queens’ education see Retha M. Warnicke, *Women of the English Renaissance and Reformation* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1983).

¹⁹ D. M. Loades, *Mary Tudor: A Life* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989), 43.

²⁰ Cited in Janet M. Green, “‘I My Self’: Queen Elizabeth I’s Oration at Tilbury Camp,” *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 28-2 (1997): note 4.

²¹ For Katherine Parr’s piety and patronage see Anthony Martienssen, *Queen Katherine Parr* (London: Cardinal, 1975), 189-224; James Kelsey McConica, “The Last Years of the Reign: the Role of Catherine Parr,” in his *English Humanists and Reformation Politics under Henry VIII and Edward VI* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965), 200-34; John N. King, “Patronage and Piety: The Influence of Catherine Parr,” in *Silent But for the Words: Tudor Women as Patrons, Translators, and Writers of Religious Works*, ed. Margaret Patterson Hannay (Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1985), 47-51; William P. Haugaard, “Katherine Parr: the Religious Convictions of a Renaissance Queen,” *Renaissance Quarterly* 22 (1969):346-59 and Janel Muller, “A Tudor Queen Finds Voice: Katherine Parr’s Lamentation of a Sinner,” in *Historical Renaissance: New Essays on Tudor and Stuart Literature and Culture*, ed. Heather Dubrow and Richard Strier (Chicago: the University of Chicago Press 1988), 15-47.

Queen Katherine organised the royal nursery in December 1543, not long after she married King Henry VIII in July, for all her stepchildren, which brought Edward, Mary and Elizabeth under one roof. Through her patronage, Katherine Parr selected a group of distinguished Protestant humanists, such as Roger Ascham, John Aylmer, John Foxe and Thomas Wilson, to provide instruction for the royal children and her associates. From 1543 to the last months of Katherine's life in 1548, Elizabeth was continually put under the care of the Queen, who herself as a learned and devotional woman had decisive influence on Elizabeth's religious and classical inclination. The Princess's translation of Marguerite de Navarre's *Le Miroir de L'âme Pécheresse* as a New Year's gift for her stepmother clearly acknowledged the impact of Katherine's Erasmian pietism.²²

Afterwards, it was Roger Ascham who had considerable intellectual influence on Elizabeth. He was appointed as Elizabeth's tutor in 1548 by Katherine and retained this position until 1550. He also later continued to guide her learning by correspondence and became her Latin Secretary after Elizabeth's accession. Roger Ascham's *The Schoolmaster* (1570) leaves us the first-hand account of Elizabeth's distinctive talent in languages and excellence in classical works. He praised his young pupil as more intelligent and more industrious than the young men he had taught at Cambridge University,

It is your shame (I speak to you all, you young gentlemen of England) that one maid should go beyond you all in excellency of learning and knowledge of divers tongues. Point forth six of the best-given gentlemen of this court, and all they together show not so much good will, spend not so much time,

²² Haugaard, "Katherine Parr: the Religious Convictions of a Renaissance Queen," 347.

bestow not so much hours, daily, orderly, and constantly, for the increase of learning and knowledge as doth the Queen's Majesty herself.

Moreover, Elizabeth was excellent in Latin, Italian, French, Spanish, and according to Ascham, she also read Greek works of Isocrates and Sophocles as well as patristic authors and the New Testament.²³

It is certain that humanist ideas about women's upbringing and the female sex had an impact on the self-perception of Queen Mary and Elizabeth, for both of them were immersed in humanist instruction in their early years. The essence of humanist education for women was principally founded by Thomas More, Erasmus and Juan Luis Vives, whose pedagogical methods were followed by Tudor second generation humanists, such as Roger Ascham.²⁴ Humanist ideas upon women's education recognised women's spiritual and intellectual equality to men and were comparatively progressive in this age. Nevertheless, to a great extent, it sustained the conventional constructions of gender roles and viewed women as inferior to men and unsuitable to rule.

The humanist programme was basically intended to instruct women to fit into the domestic function—to be better spiritual companions to their husbands and better mothers to guide their own children—rather than to cultivate leading scholars or politicians in their own right. Moreover, the goal of women's inculcation focused more on the female virtues of piety, chastity and modesty than on sound learning, much less for political and public services. Vives insisted that “I give no licence to

²³ Roger Ascham, *The Schoolmaster*, ed. Lawrence V. Ryan (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, published for the Folger Shakespeare Library, 1967), 56, 57.

²⁴ Warnicke, *Women of the English Renaissance*, 95.

a woman to be a teacher, nor to have authority of the man, but to be in silence.”²⁵ Correspondingly, women’s learning was confined to training in language, and their reading was concentrated on religious material and classical moral works. In sum, women were sheltered, protected, and restricted to the domestic function under the humanist thinking.

Moreover, the humanist programme was primarily designed for women to enter matrimony, in accordance with humanists’ partiality towards married life. It strongly suggested wives’ subordination to husbands, although they valued the mutual respect in a conjugal relationship. Erasmus in his *The Institution of Marriage*, which was dedicated to Catherine of Aragon in 1526, claims that

although there must be mutual respect, both nature and scriptural authority lay down that the wife should obey her husband rather than the opposite. Paul recommends love and gentleness to husbands But what does he prescribe for the women? Obedience and submissiveness: “You women,” he says, “be subject to your husbands as to the Lord.” For this reason nature has endowed the male sex with a certain ruthlessness and fierceness, but the female with softness and gentleness.

Erasmus argues that the best way for a woman to rule—to win her husband’s affection—is through “obedience.”²⁶ This undoubtedly created a dilemma for the two prospective queen regnants. If they married, as most of their subjects expected, it would become controversial as to whether they should obey their husbands as wives, or be obeyed by their husbands as head of the country.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Erasmus, *The Institution of Marriage*, in *Erasmus on Women*, ed. Erika Rummel (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996), 97, 95.

As a whole, women's humanist education did not suggest any suitable political roles for women, nor did it provide sufficient training for their public participation. One may think that Mary and Elizabeth, trained with the humanist conception of gender roles, were unlikely to have a differing perception of the female sex from other women, and more unlikely to hold a strong sense of rulership. However, the extent to which humanist ideology could influence these two queens' self-identity and their view of female rulership is largely speculative. Firstly, education is not the sole and most powerful agent of shaping one's character; other elements such as experience and social status are equal, if not more formative, influences upon one's view of the world and society. Nonetheless, in another sense, the humanist instruction which encapsulated the traditional constructions of the female sex provided the queens with a mirror of social reality—contemporary society's expectation of women's virtue and behaviour. This was a valuable reflection of the faces they should appropriate. Secondly, the queens' early self-perceptions, formed by humanist construction, would not have been absolutely unchangeable. On the contrary, both the queens themselves and their supporters could strive to reshape people's conception of female rulership, bringing a new image of the queen's rule and thereby modifying the old cultural establishment. Queen Elizabeth, in particular, was conscious of the significance of self-performance in fashioning her rule, as she famously described the world as a stage:

For we Princes are set as it were upon Stages in the Sight and view of all the World. The least Spot is soon spied in our Garments, the smallest Blemish

presently observed in us at a great Distance. It behooveth us therefore to be careful that our Proceedings be just and honourable.²⁷

Correspondingly, the reigns of Mary and Elizabeth engendered proliferation of writings of the “mirror-for-queens” (chiefly dedicated to these two queens). This genre of writings can be viewed in contrast with *speculum principis* or the “mirror-for-princes” which served as eulogies and advice-books for a prince’s rule,²⁸ yet the former primarily addressed the issues concerning the princess’s/queen’s rule. The role of these writings, however, has not been seriously and systematically discussed by modern scholarship.

Some of the “mirror-for-princesses,” such as John Christopherson’s *An Exhortation to All Menne to Take Hede and Beware of Rebellion* (1554) and John Aylmer’s *An Harborowe for Faithfull and Treve Subjects against the late Blown Blast* (1559), aimed to uphold the righteousness of the queen’s rule and promote the queen’s religious image. Some, such as John Proctor’s *The Waie Home to Christ and Truth Written by Vincent of Lerins* (1554) and John Prime’s *The Consolations of David, breefly applied to queene Elizabeth* (1588), expressed the glory of these two queens’ governance. Others, such as the anonymous pamphlet *A Supplicacyon to the Queenes Majestie* (1555) and John Stubbs’ *The Discoverie of a Gaping Gulf whereinto England is like to be Swallowed by an other French Marriage* (1579), reflected the controversy of Mary’s and Elizabeth’s marriages. Taken together,

²⁷ William Camden, *The History of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princess Elizabeth*, ed. Wallace, T. MacCaffrey (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press), 262.

²⁸ For the discussion of the “mirror-for-princes” in the period of Renaissance, see Quentin Skinner, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, I, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), 118-38, 213-43.

those writings functioned either to give advice on the queen's rule or to restructure the discourses of queenship in order to reinforce the queens' virtuous and godly image, to endorse their legitimacy or to underpin their religious, political and matrimonial policies. Although some discrepancies may have existed between the queens' self-presentation and the writers' ideas, these works, as a whole, moulded the features of Tudor queenship along with the queens' own performances. This thesis will therefore acknowledge the humanist tradition as the cultural background of the fashioning of Tudor queenship, yet choose to view the queens themselves and the writers of the "mirror-for-queens" as the main agents in fashioning English queenship from 1553 to 1603.

Accordingly, the voices and actions of the queens themselves and the texts of the "mirror-for-princesses" are the primary sources to be investigated and compared in this thesis. The two queens' speeches, letters, and their conversations with the principal ministers and ambassadors are the most significant sources for us to examine their self-fashioning. In the sixteenth century, an age without mass media, the most important audience for both queens to project their appropriate images onto were the members of parliament who could greatly influence public opinion, and foreign ambassadors whose reports of the queens' behaviour and ideas formed the basic information for their masters to use in determining policies towards England. Therefore, this thesis will largely rely on the queens' parliamentary speeches and the conversations with ambassadors which were recorded in the State Papers, in order to search for the modes of the queens' self-fashioning.

With respect to the “mirror-for-princesses,” the reign of Mary produced relatively few of this form of writings, and the extant works have not been substantially investigated by modern historians. This thesis therefore attempts to include all the important texts in that period, particularly John Christopherson’s *An Exhortation* which is the most comprehensive defense of Mary’s government. On the contrary, provided that Elizabeth’s long reign had provoked tremendous works in representing the Queen with so abundant modern research, this thesis does not view it as necessary to include all the texts. Instead, a selection will be made according to the works’ significance and representative quality. In addition, special focus will be put on those which are worth more attention than modern scholarship has given.

iv. Three issues of queenship

This thesis is divided into three parts, each of which will discuss one significant issue aroused by the queen’s rule during the reigns of Mary and Elizabeth: the cultivation of queenly virtues, the legitimacy of the queen’s rule, and the queen’s matrimony. These three issues are not particularly confined to ruling queens, but have also challenged many male rulers. However, the queen’s female sex greatly deepened the complexity and difficulty of her rule so that every issue presented different challenges for queen regnants from those faced by male rulers. Similarly, the resolutions provided by the queens’ supporters in order to cope with the vulnerability of female rule were largely in consideration of the weakness of the queens’ gender roles. The term gender refers to the cultural and intellectual

construction of men and women in their social relationships. It has become a useful tool with which recent scholarship has explored women's history and other neglected fields in history.²⁹ Nevertheless, as Gisela Bock stresses, gender "must be perceived as context-specific and context-dependent. . . . Its power is not one of elimination—by reducing history to a model — but of illumination, as a means to explore historical variety and variability."³⁰ Gender will not be treated in this research as the sole conditioning factor of the queens' dilemma, just as their sex was not the only reason for the outpourings of their adversaries. Instead, the deployment of gender in the two queens' self-fashioning and in the writings of "mirror-for-queens" will be focused upon alongside religious and political elements and other social constructions.

The three parts of this thesis will start with an introduction to the broad cultural concern about queenly virtues, and follow on with more specific political and gender questions relating to the controversies of the queens' rule and queen regnants' matrimony. This does not imply that political and matrimonial issues are isolated from cultural issues; rather, the former two will be viewed within the framework of cultural constructions in the sixteenth century.

Part One, on the cultivation of queenly virtues, views the means by which Mary and Elizabeth and their eulogists glorified the virtue and godliness of the queens and

²⁹ Joan W. Scott defines the term gender as "is a constitutive element of social relationships based on perceived difference between the sexes." See her "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis," *American Historical Review* 91(1986):1067.

³⁰ Gisela Bock, "Women's History and Gender History: Aspects of an International Debate," *Gender and History* 1-1 (1989):11.

their rule. In the Renaissance, virtue had become the key to achieving fame, glory and honour, even though there were different perceptions about what virtue entailed for men and for women. A ruling queen's task consisted in appropriating both masculine and feminine standards of virtue, a double necessity in order to reach the image of a virtuous and powerful ruler. Chapter 1 begins with investigating the formation of a sixteenth-century ideology of "queenly virtue," in comparison with contemporary perception of "princely virtue," through humanist texts and the queens' self-representations. It then considers Mary's cultivation of queenly virtues and her supporters' idealisation, both of which concentrated on the representation of Mary as the Virgin Mary. Paralleling Mary's image as the Virgin Queen, Chapter 2 reviews the connection between Queen Elizabeth and the Virgin Mary in contemporary works and modern scholarship. Moreover, it focuses on the strength of Elizabeth's own presentation of her virtues, which demonstrated Elizabeth's talent for exploiting the ambiguity of gender roles and greater sensitivity to princely qualities.

Part Two, on the legitimacy of the queen's rule, investigates the strategies of Queen Mary and Elizabeth and their apologists in legitimising their right to rule. Significantly, there were two aspects of the sixteenth-century discourse: one focused on hereditary right, a legal term; the other dealt with the fitness of a ruler, involving cultural and religious dimensions. No sooner had Queen Mary succeeded to the throne than both issues arose. Queen Mary attempted immediately to legitimise her right of rule through military suppression and parliamentary legislation. Her government also conducted a campaign of political propaganda to reinforce people's

allegiance to the Queen. Chapter 3 investigates the actions of Queen Mary herself, and her supporters' propaganda in opposition to Marian dissenters. In comparison with Mary, Chapter 4 examines Queen Elizabeth's performance in legitimising her occupation of the English throne, as well as her apologists' efforts to endorse Elizabeth's rule by arguing for her hereditary right and perfect fitness to govern.

Part Three elaborates on the processes by which the two queens justified and styled their choices for matrimony, and the reasons their supporters invoked to oppose or to stand up for the queen's choice. The issue of marriage was a dangerous dilemma for a ruling queen and for her subjects, for she would threaten dynastic continuity should she remain a virgin; or jeopardise her nation by the interest of her consort if she married. Worse, a queen was customarily presumed to marry an equal, usually a foreign prince, but in this case, the fear of foreign infiltration would considerably challenge people's trust in the queen's care of her own country. Mary's alliance with the Spanish Prince, Philip, has been viewed by historians as one of the greatest mistakes of her reign, sadly bringing England to the war with France and resulting in the loss of Calais. Nevertheless, how Mary elucidated her attitude towards marriage to her subjects and how she formulated her argument for her decision on a Spanish match are actually more significant for revealing the sixteenth-century culture of self-fashioning than that unpleasant failure. Chapter 5, therefore, studies Mary's own justification for the Spanish match, and the arguments of her supporters and those who were opposed to the Spanish marriage. Contrasting with Mary's resolute decision, Chapter 6 inspects the reasons why

Elizabeth opted for virginity, focusing on her predicament during the courtship of the Duke of Alençon from 1579 to 1584.

Each of these three issues—queenly virtue, legitimacy, and matrimony—offers a different way to explore these two queens’ self-perception and self-fashioning. Moreover, each of them provides a different aspect by which to scrutinise the similarity and disparity between the theory and the practice, and between the writers and the queens in their fashioning of English queenship in the latter half of the sixteenth century. The purpose of this research is to understand the nature and characteristics of these queens’ rule in Tudor England through a new approach, linking the two queens by three critical issues relating to their political power and image. In doing so, it proposes to make a contribution to the study of Mary’s rule which has not been sufficiently analysed in the past. In addition, it aims to bring a new comprehension of Elizabeth’s reign by broadening its horizon to the context of Renaissance and through drawing a comparison with Mary’s rule.

Part One

The Cultivation of Queenly Virtues

Virtue . . . is a faculty of providing and preserving good things, a faculty productive of many and great benefits, in fact, of all things in all cases. The components of virtue are justice, courage, self-control, magnificence, magnanimity, liberality, gentleness, practical and speculative wisdom. The greatest virtues are necessarily those which are most useful to other. . . . For this reason justice and courage are the most esteemed.

Aristotle, *Art of Rhetoric*, I.ix.

Chapter 1

Queen Mary:

the Centrality of Womanly Virtues

The theme of virtue was one of the central issues which confronted both sixteenth-century ruling queens and kings. Sixteenth-century theorists believed that rulers must fashion themselves according to their status; as Erasmus addressed them, “when once you have dedicated yourself to the state, you are no longer at liberty to live in your own way: you must maintain and cultivate the role you have undertaken.”¹ As the essence of a ruler’s self-fashioning, it was widely presumed that the cultivation of virtues was central to Renaissance monarchy. The topic of virtue thus became significant in humanist reflections over the ideal politics and princes’ education from the beginning of the Renaissance, which found its most influential voice in Petrarch. His interpretation of the Ciceronian concept of *honestas* and *virtus* and his admiration of the Stoic virtues (or the Cardinal virtues) was then followed by Italian humanists, especially amongst the Neoplatonists.² Through their belief in human free will, the Neoplatonists advocated that everyone

¹ Erasmus, *The Education of a Christian Prince*, in *Collected Works of Erasmus*, vol. 27, trans. Neil M. Cheshire and Michael J. Heath (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986), 237.

² Maristella Lorch, “Petrarch, Cicero, and the Classical Pagan Tradition,” in *Renaissance Humanism: Foundation, Forms, and Legacy*, I, ed. Albert Rabil (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988), 74-76.

could achieve personal honour and fame and develop noble and moral deeds through the inculcation of liberal arts.

This formula was developed further in the humanist cult of princely rule from the late fifteenth century to the sixteenth century.³ Humanist writers attributed good princely rule to the prince's virtue, as elucidated in Italian and Northern "mirror-for-princes" texts in the form of advice-books or eulogies. These works were typically dedicated to famous princes: Diomedes Carafa wrote *The Office of a Good Prince* for Ferdinand of Naples in the 1480s; Machiavelli dedicated his *The Prince* to Lorenzo de Medici in 1515; Erasmus's *The Education of a Christian Prince* was addressed to the Emperor Charles V in 1516. Although interpretations of virtuous rule were not all the same—Machiavelli's idea in particular was far different from other humanists⁴—such writers invariably accentuated that the key to achieve good rule and successful government was in the rulers' virtue.

Italian writers of "mirror-for-princes" declared that *virtus* or *virtù* was the only means for princes to overcome the malice of fortune and gain the goals of honour, glory and fame. Likewise, Northern humanists argued that virtue was the sole definition of true nobility; hence, "if you are eager for the recognition of fame, . . . it is far better to create in your character a monument to virtue."⁵ Moreover, a prince

³ See Quentin Skinner, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, I (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), 113-18. Skinner terms this development as "the age of princes," and a change with it was that the humanist writings tend to "overlook the figure of the individual citizen, and to concentrate all their attention on the far more imposing and influential figure of the prince." 116.

⁴ See Skinner, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, 131-36, and his *Machiavelli* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981). An account of Machiavelli very different from Skinner's is Harvey C. Mansfield, Jr., *Machiavelli's Virtue* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996).

⁵ Erasmus, *The Education of a Christian Prince*, 215.

was not only supposed to be more capable of attaining virtuous qualities by his noble birth and education. Renaissance rulers were also thought to possess different virtues from ordinary citizens in order to maintain their states or exercise good rule.⁶ Hence the virtues which a prince should cultivate consisted of a formidable list of heroic qualities, combining the cardinal virtues—prudence, temperance, fortitude and justice—and Christian virtues—piety, religion and faith—along with some specific princely virtues, such as liberality, magnificence, clemency and keeping one's promise.⁷

The humanist doctrine concerning the prince's virtues made it crystal-clear that political success stemmed from the ruler's personal qualities. Essentially, every ruler was required to obtain and/or demonstrate those virtues which the humanists had listed. Thus, theoretically, since virtue was so pivotal to the humanists' ideal government, the pursuit of the rulers' virtues should be indispensable for every ruler even if the throne was occupied by a woman. However, when the humanist idea of princely virtues was applied to female rulers, it was full of ambiguity. Firstly, humanist discussion of rulers' virtues was built upon the premise of male government as their works were principally addressed to magnificent contemporary male rulers. Secondly, as the term "*virtus*" derived from "*vir*" (man), women's

⁶ It is a thought stemmed from Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* which supposed that a man as a complex being has a variety of roles and functions, so does his status in different historical moment and social condition. Therefore, different men are required to obtain different virtues and everybody's ability to attain some virtues is different along with one's social statue, sex, and age. For the different capacity for moral virtues between man and woman see Ian Maclean, *The Renaissance Notion of Woman: A Study in the Fortunes of Scholasticism and Medical Science in European Intellectual Life* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 49-52.

⁷ Skinner, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, I, 126-8, 229-31.

capacity to attain virtue had even been disputed in the Renaissance to the extent that some writers questioned their possession of free will. The question of the nature and existence of queenly virtues therefore remained equivocal.

The question of a woman's virtue nevertheless underwent more positive development in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries than in the Middle Ages, thanks to some of the humanists' preoccupation with women's education, in particular Erasmus and Vives.⁸ They revived Plato's belief that both men and women had an equal capacity to enter the moral world. However, they still asserted that women required a different kind of virtue from men, and were inclined to identify the female sex with passive virtues, such as chastity, silence, modesty, obedience and long-suffering. Generally, the humanist works on women's education did not wish to alter women's traditional social roles, or challenge wives' traditional subordination to their husbands. Moreover, although they intended to change the social customs of women's upbringing, women's learning was still limited to purely domestic functions. For instance, Vives excluded the training of eloquence from women's education in his *De institutione feminae christianae* (1523). He argued that a man must cultivate diverse knowledge because he not only takes charge of his own business, but also of public affairs; "as for a woman, she hath not charge to see to,

⁸ For the idea of Erasmus and Vives on women's upbringing see J. K. Sowards, "Erasmus and the Education of Women," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 13-14 (1982): 77-89; Alan W. Reese, "Learning Virginitly: Erasmus' ideal of Christian Marriage," *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 57-3 (1995): 551-67; Valerie Wayne, "Some Sad Sentence: Vives' Instruction of a Christian Women," in *Silent but for the Words: Tudor Women as Patrons Translators, and Writers of Religious Works*, ed. Margaret P. Hannay (Kent, Ohio.: Kent State University Press, 1985); Constance Jordan, *Renaissance Feminism: Literary Texts and Political Models* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990) 117-19.

but her honesty and chastity.” Therefore, a woman was taught to fashion herself by the virtue of “silence,” which is the “great ornament of the whole feminine sex,” instead of eloquence.⁹

Under these circumstances, it was doubtful how a sixteenth-century ruling queen could circumvent the traditional moral virtues which were usually assigned by men to women in general. It was also obscure as to what sort of virtues she had to cultivate in order to fulfil both her political duty and moral good. Indeed, a queen regnant, like Mary Tudor, could not find much theoretical support for her rule and behaviour from most humanist works. Most Renaissance theorists differentiated women’s virtues from men’s in accordance with their different physical and mental attributes. That is to say, they believed that the man, more robust and audacious, was better suited for a public, acquisitive role; a woman, more tender and timid, was good at custody of children and household goods. Therefore, men and women should acquire complementary qualities in the divine institution of marriage according to the dichotomy of private and public functions.¹⁰

Nevertheless, there was still an exit for some women to escape from the general doctrines of women’s virtue—the category of exceptional women in literature, a genre of writings made for praising of famous and distinguished women, especially those women in power. This genre originated in Plutarch’s *Mulierum virtutes* and was continued in Giovanni Boccaccio’s *De mulieribus claris* (1380). Boccaccio’s

⁹ Vives, *The Instruction of a Christian Woman*, in *Vives and the Renaissance Education of Women*, ed. Foster Watson (London: Edward Arnold, 1912), 34, 207.

¹⁰ Maclean, *The Renaissance Notion of Woman*, 56-59.

work praised 106 famous women from antiquity, and inspired several later humanist works praising noteworthy women, such as Christine de Pizan's *Le Livre de la Cité des Dames* (1405), Baldesar Castiglione's *Libro del cortegiano* (1528), Heinrich Cornelius Agrippa's *De nobilitate et praecellentia Foemenei sexus* (1529), and Thomas Elyot's *The Defence of Good Women* (1540). Women's worth loomed much larger in such works than in humanist writings on women's education, for the former predominantly emphasise woman's supremacy over man in virtue, without mentioning any weakness in female dispositions. In praising extraordinary female paragons, these works celebrated woman's heroic virtues of prudence, courage, liberality and eloquence, very similar to the rulers' virtues claimed by the "mirror-for-princes." However, like humanist works on women's education, they did not clearly answer the question of queenly virtues, nor did they clarify the connection between queenly virtues and those virtues established for male rulers. In addition, they did not ever seriously acknowledge the conflict between the virtues of women in general and that of princesses who were endowed with political duties and therefore needed to obtain certain virtues contrary to those recommended to women in general.

In fact, the question of queenly virtues was an opaque and complicated one for sixteenth-century scholars, and their answers were largely indirect. Nevertheless, those works extolling illustrious women and queens, in a way, still provide us with some clue about the humanists' delineation of queenly virtues. This chapter therefore beings by revealing the idea of sixteenth-century queenly virtues through an examination of humanist writings on exceptional women. Yet it should also be

reiterated that the sixteenth-century queenly virtues were embodied more by the queens' own actions and rituals than by any humanist eulogies to queens. Any neglect of that fact will make the picture of the queenly virtues incomplete. Therefore, the examination of humanist writings will be connected with the examples of Isabella of Castile and two Tudor queen consorts—Catherine of Aragon and Anne Boleyn—so as to assess the cultural context in which Mary I and Elizabeth I might fashion and present themselves. Subsequently, we can identify a model by which to inspect Mary's cultivation of virtues and her image-making represented by herself and her Catholic supporters.

I. The ideal picture of queenly virtues

Three continental and one English works form the basis of our understanding of the formulation of sixteenth-century queen's virtues: Christine de Pizan's *Le Livre de la Cité des Dames*, Agrippa's *De nobilitate et praecellentia foeminei sexus*, Castiglione's *Libro del cortegiano*, and Thomas Elyot's *The Defence of Good Women*. All of these continental works were translated into English in the sixteenth-century, and Castiglione and Agrippa had even stayed in England for a time, in 1506 and 1510 respectively.¹¹ It should be noted that most of the authors and translators had connections with Catherine of Aragon, Mary's mother and the

¹¹ See Linda Woodbridge, *Women and the English Renaissance: Literature and the Nature of Womanhood, 1540-1620* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1984), 72n. She indicates that "Castiglione spent 1506 in England on a diplomatic mission, where he created a great stir in humanist circles; Agrippa spent 1510 in England on a diplomatic mission and was introduced to humanist circles by John Colet."

initiator of the Tudor court school for noblewomen. Some of them were even her potential supporters during her trial for divorce.¹² Hence, all of these works can be viewed together as the background of Tudor queen regnants' self-identity and self-fashioning.

Christine de Pizan was the most notable female writers in the Renaissance literary debate about women, which had been primarily conducted by men. Her work was translated into English as *The Boke of the Cyte of Ladyes* by Brian Ansley in 1521.¹³ What distinguishes it from such texts as the *Mulierum virtutes* and *De mulieribus claris* is not only that it rewrites history from the female point of view, but also that it attacks existing misogynists' underestimation of women's nature and worth. De Pizan's *Cité* proclaims women's capacity for virtues, learning and governing; yet this does not imply less emphasis on women's virtues of chastity, obedience and modesty than in other humanist works. Especially in the conclusion, de Pizan commands that "all women—whether noble, bourgeois, or lower-class—be

¹² See Maria Dowling, "Humanist Support for Katherine of Aragon," *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 57 (1984): 46-55; Constance Jordan, "Feminism and the Humanists: the Case of Sir Thomas Elyot's Defence of Good Women," in *Rewriting the Renaissance: the Discourse of Sexual Difference in Early Modern Europe*, eds. Margaret W. Ferguson, Maureen Quilligan and Nancy J. Vickers (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), 245-47.

¹³ Constance Jordan suggests that its translation and publication in England had some political reference to Catherine of Aragon, Queen Mary's mother, to enhance the legitimacy of woman's rule. Jordan, *Renaissance Feminism*, 105-06. Studies of Christine De Pizan's life and works see Maureen Quilligan, *The Allegory of Female Authority: Christine De Pizan's Cité Des Dames* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991); Charity Cannon Willard, *Christine de Pizan: Her Life and Works* (New York: Persea Books, 1984); Margaret Barbant ed., *Politics, Gender, & Genre: The Political Thought of Christine De Pizan* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1992); Susan Groag Bell, "Christine de Pizan (1364-1430): humanism and the problem of a studious woman," *Feminist Studies* 3(1976): 173-84; Deniel Kempton, "Christine de Pizan's *Cité des Dames* and *Trésor de la Cité: Toward a Feminist Scriptural Practice*," in *Political Rhetoric, Power, and Renaissance Women*, eds. Carole Levin and Patricia A. Sullivan (Albany: State University of New York, 1995); Rosalind Brown-Grant, *Christine de Pizan and the Moral Defence of Women: Reading beyond Gender* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

well-informed in all things and cautious in defending your honour and chastity against your enemies.” For de Pizan, chastity, humility and patience are still the main virtues of women in general. As for married women, she suggests conventionally, subordination to their husbands is better than independence, “for sometimes it is not the best thing for a creature to be independent.”¹⁴

Allocating women’s primary qualities and roles in society according to a sort of functionalism based on God’s ordained hierarchy is a key point in de Pizan’s book. She states that “God did not ordain that men fulfil the offices of women, and women the offices of men, . . . God has similarly ordained man and woman to serve Him in different offices and also to aid and comfort one another, each in their ordained task, and to each sex has given a fitting and appropriate nature and inclination to fulfil their offices.”¹⁵ This divine hierarchy is embodied in the existing social structure where normally men take charge of wars, laws, courts and governing, while women manage the households and follow men’s commandments. Therefore, de Pizan urges women to accept their place in society rather than actively incite the overthrow of traditional hierarchy.

With regard to queenly virtues, the Lady of Reason, one of the three allegorical ladies who help de Pizan to build the city of ladies, provides several distinctive examples of powerful queens who can illustrate women’s capability and the essential virtues in governing. Generally, all those queens, like distinguished male rulers,

¹⁴ Christine de Pizan, *The Book of the City of Ladies*, trans. Earl Jeffrey Richards (New York: Persea Books, 1982), 256, 255.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 31.

demonstrated enormous heroic qualities of bravery, courage, prudence, wisdom, learning, generosity, magnificence and great strength. Essentially, each of them was able to adopt masculine appearance; Fredegund, wife of the French King Chilperic I and then a widow who ruled the kingdom for her son, Clotar II, states that “I will abandon all feminine fear and arm my heart with a man’s boldness in order to increase your courage and that of the soldiers in the army.”¹⁶ More significantly, most of the viragos mentioned by the Lady of Reason are widows who governed the countries on behalf of their sons, such as Queen Fredegund, Queen Blanche, Queen Artemisia, and Queen Cappadocia; or virgins who insisted on remaining unmarried for their whole life, such as Queen Nicaula, Queen of Amazons and Queen Semiramis. It seems that de Pizan feels less constrained in her social context to have widows and virgins presenting strong and dominant characters without challenging the husbands’ authority.

The only queen in de Pizan’s category of brave and valiant women whose strength had been demonstrated before she became a widow is Zenobia, Queen of Palmyra. However, a closer look will discover that de Pizan’s praise of Zenobia’s virtue before she became a widow does not refer to her masculine qualities, but concentrates on her chastity. According to the Lady Reason, Queen Zenobia refused to marry for a long time and wished to keep her virginity for life before being forced to marry by her parents. Nevertheless, she was “supremely chaste,” even after the marriage; “not only did she avoid other men, but she also slept with her

¹⁶ Ibid., 59.

husband only to have children, and demonstrated this clearly by not sleeping with her husband when she was pregnant.”¹⁷ Queen Zenobia is hence praised for her remarkable love, loyalty and chastity towards her husband, just as other widowed queens are exalted as chaste wives and devoted mothers. Similarly, many other good examples of queen consorts provided by the Lady Rectitude are portrayed in the image of chaste and faithful wives, always holding “perfect love” and long-suffering. Queen Hypsicratea, for example, showed herself at all times as a faithful wife and never left her husband wherever he went, “even though this king had several concubines.”¹⁸ The whole picture of queenly virtues displayed by Christine de Pizan is therefore a blurred boundary between men’s virtues and women’s virtues. Put in another way, a virtuous queen is qualified by acquiring both heroic masculine virtues and submissive feminine qualities. Even though she is a ruling queen, the moral qualities of chastity and subjection to her husband are indispensable companions to her political power.

The same picture of queenly virtues, albeit on a smaller scale, is demonstrated in Thomas Elyot’s *The Defence of Good Women*. Elyot’s *Defence* is a dialogue between a detractor and defender of women, Caninius and Candidus.¹⁹ In the first part of this dialogue, Candidus refutes Caninius’s Aristotelian negative notion of the female sex, and provides several examples of noteworthy queens and noblewomen to

¹⁷ Ibid., 54.

¹⁸ Ibid., 120-21.

¹⁹ Elyot dedicated this work to Anne of Cleves, the third wife of Henry VIII. For studies of Elyot and this work, see Stanford E. Lehmberg, *Sir Thomas Elyot: Tudor Humanist* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1960); Jordan, “Feminism and the Humanism: the Case of Sir Thomas Elyot’s *Defence of Good Women*.”

authenticate women's chastity and constancy. In the second part, Candidus moves beyond women's domestic functions and further asserts women's ability to govern, in their capacity for the political virtues of courage, prudence, wisdom and discretion.

In the final part of Elyot's work, the defence of women is expressed by a queen, Queen Zenobia of Palmyra, who ruled her husband's kingdom after he died. Zenobia functions as the model of ideal female rulers and queenly virtues. She embodies the combination of cardinal virtues (a main part of the princely virtues) and women's faithfulness and obedience to their husbands. She comments on her own fashioning of queenly virtues;

I perceyued that without *prudence* and *constancy*, women mought be broughte lyghtely into errour & foly, and made therfore vnmeet for that companye, wherevnto they were ordeyned: I meane, to be assistance & comfort to man through theyr *fidelity*. . . . I found also, that *Iustyce* teacheth vs womenne, to honour our husbandes nexte after god: which honour resteth in due *obedience*, By *Fortitude* are we still kept in a vertuouse constancy, as wel in resistinge affections and wanton persuasion, as also to susteyne . . . afflyctions pacyently. But in a woman, no vertue is equal to *Temperaunce*, wherby in her wordes and dedes she alway vseth a iust moderation, knowynge whan time is to speke, and whan to kepe silence, . . . And if she measure it to the wyll of her husbande, she dothe the more wisely

Zenobia made good use of the Cardinal virtues to elucidate the morals of a wife to her husband. She continues to describe her love for her husband that "I was neuer harde or sene, say or do any thyng, which mought not contente hym, or omytte any thyng, which shulde delite hym."²⁰ Elyot's Zenobia, like Christine de Pizan's ladies in her *Cité*, demonstrates that the successful self-fashioning and self-

²⁰ Thomas Elyot, *The Defence of Good Women*, ed. Edwin Johnston Howard (Oxford, Ohio: the Anchor Press, 1940), 56-7, 58. The accentuation is mine.

representation of a ruling queen is actually a particular deployment of both virile virtues and feminine goodness. She must cross over the boundary to satisfy both social expectations of a ruler and a woman.

The existence of a ruling queen indeed was a paradox—a woman in a man's place—in the traditional conception of gender. It also formed a kind of tension in traditional society, which motivated several writers in the sixteenth century to try to resolve it. Agrippa's *De nobilitate et praecellentia foemenei sexus* was one of those works that aimed to eliminate this tension by actively justifying women's superiority and right of rule. The treatise was translated into English as *Of the Nobilitie and Excellencie of Womenkynde* by Thomas Clapham in 1542.²¹ Agrippa reinterprets Scripture and argues, differently from medieval scholars, that no matter by name, by place in the order of creation, or by material of creation, Eve/woman is the most honourable and perfect product of God, "she is the queen of all creatures and their end, perfection, and glory, absolute perfection."²² He even attributes the fall of human beings to the sin of Adam, instead of Eve; "it was . . . the man who committed the sin in eating, not the woman, the man who brought death, not the woman. And all of us have sinned in Adam, not in Eve."²³ Therefore, Agrippa maintains that the customary practice of rejecting women's participation in politics is contrary to the

²¹ Agrippa's book was dedicated to Margaret of Austria to compliment her regency in order to gain her patronage. The latest translation is done by Albert Rabil, *Declamation on the Nobility and Preeminence of the Female Sex* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1996). For the study of Agrippa's life and works see Charles Garfield Nauert, *Agrippa and the Crisis of Renaissance Thought* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1965); Barbare Newman, "Renaissance Feminism and Esoteric Theology: the Case of Cornelius Agrippa," *Viator: Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 24 (1993): 337-56.

²² Agrippa, *Declamation*, 48.

²³ *Ibid.*, 62.

word of God. His reinterpretation of Scripture influenced many later defences of women's government, including John Aylmer's *Harborowe for Faithfull and Trewe Subjectes* (1559). Agrippa also in his treatise catalogues a large number of illustrious women from antiquity and Scripture to glorify women's superior virtues. Yet, aside from women's eloquence and learning, he still concentrates on female qualities of mercy, piety, beauty, constancy and modesty.

The Third Book of Castiglione's *Libro del cortegiano* was another work which influenced the formulation of sixteenth-century queenly virtues. The work was translated into English later than the other works in 1561 as *The Book of the Courtier* by Thomas Hoby.²⁴ Castiglione supplies the readers with a number of examples of brave women and faithful wives through the eloquent mouth of Magnifico Giuliano, in counterattacking the misogynist Signor Gaspare. Giuliano, represented a spirit of boldness and innovation in this age, quotes from an arsenal of stories about queens such as Theodolinda, Queen of Lombards, Theodora, the Greek Empress, Queen Anne of France, and Queen Isabella of Castile. He is convinced that these queens' virtues of prudence, justice, courage and magnanimity and their achievement in fame and honour can be compared with any kings without the slightest inferiority.²⁵ Giuliano's view is radical amongst his fellow courtiers; he argues that a king's

²⁴ Studies of the life and works of Castiglione see Wayne A. Rehorn, *Courtly Performances: Masking and Festivity in Castiglione's "Book of the Courtier"* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1978); J. R. Woodhouse, *Baldesar Castiglione: a Reassessment of the Courtier* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1978); Robert W. Hanning and David Rosand eds., *Castiglione: the Ideal and the Real in Renaissance Culture* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983); Peter Burke, *The Fortunes of the Courtier: the European Reception Castiglione's Cortegiano* (Cambridge: Polity, 1995); Stephen Kolsky, "Making and Breaking the Rules: Castiglione's *Cortegiano*," *Renaissance Studies* 11-4 (1997): 358-80.

²⁵ Baldesar Castiglione, *The Courtier*, trans. George Bull (Penguin Books, 1976), 237.

dissolute life is as equally damnable as a queen's.²⁶ None the less, the equality of male and female rulers' virtues as well as Giuliano's other more progressive opinions is balanced by another main speaker, Cesare Gonzaga. Gonzaga stresses manifestly that the virtue of chastity is the sole source of women's honour. He not only prizes women's abstention from unchaste living more highly than a man's, but also further posits chastity as an innate internalised virtue of women. He confidently states that "the only bridle which restrains them is one they put on themselves," therefore, "it is their love of true virtue which is for most women the strongest bridle, along with their anxiety to guard their honour."²⁷ Gonzaga's words imply that even though a woman is capable of ruling and attaining the heroic virtues, she would continually be ruled by chastity, the central virtue of women. Consequently, the whole picture of queenly virtues in Castiglione's work is still a syndication between masculine and feminine virtues.

This interpretation of queenly virtues can be reinforced by the self-fashioning of the first Renaissance ruling queen, Isabella of Castile. There is abundant praise of Queen Isabella in Castiglione's *Courtier* through the words of the advocate of female monarchy, Magnifico Giuliano. Isabella's virile virtues are so highly worthy in the eyes of Giuliano as to be celebrated as the most distinguished example of "every virtue." Moreover, as a woman involved in religious conflict, her courage and strength in defending her own realm, as well as her discretion in appointing able

²⁶ Ibid., 241-42.

²⁷ Ibid., 244.

ministers, are extraordinarily admired. Giuliano hence maintains that Isabella's virtues of prudence, justice, clemency and generosity are even greater than King Ferdinand, her husband. The latter was indeed rarely praised for such virtues as prudence and justice, even in Machiavelli's *Prince* which eulogies him as a great hero and a model of "a new prince" who, arising out of nothing, knows how to win reputation and make use of religion craftily; Machiavelli only sees him in "cunning and good fortune rather than wisdom and prudence."²⁸

Giuliano's narration of Isabella's heroic greatness of virtues echoes Spanish chroniclers in the reigns of Isabella and Ferdinand. They campaigned to proclaim Isabella, and her alone, as the "saviour of the kingdom,"²⁹ perhaps under the Queen's guidance. According to Giuliano, that is the universal impression left by Isabella on everyone,

unless it is the case that the people of Spain, the lords and commoners, men and women, rich and poor, have all come to an agreement deliberately to lie in her favour, there has been nowhere in the world in our time any more distinguished example of true goodness and religion, . . . than Queen Isabella; and although her fame is very great and universally known, those who lived with her and were able to witness her actions all affirm that this reputation sprang from her own merits and virtue.³⁰

²⁸ Niccolò Machiavelli, *The Prince*, trans. George Bull (Penguin Books, 1961), 70. Also see Ramón Menéndez Pidal, "The Catholic Kings According to Machiavelli and Castiglione," in *Spain in the Fifteenth Century, 1369-1516: essays and extracts by historians of Spain*, ed. Roger Highfield (London: Macmillan, 1972), 407.

²⁹ Geoffrey Woodward, *Spain in the Reigns of Isabella and Ferdinand, 1474-1516* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1997), 31. Woodward indicates that Isabella herself perhaps encouraged her chroniclers and poets so that they "portrayed the King as a second-fiddle, who responded to Isabella's lead. He was wavering and she was decisive; he was liberal and she was absolute; he was a philanderer and she was chaste," 105.

³⁰ Castiglione, *The Courtier*, 238. For the contemporary eulogy of Isabella's greatness see Ramón Menéndez Pidal, "The Significance of the Reign of Isabella the Catholic, According to her Contemporaries," and "The Catholic Kings According to Machiavelli and Castiglione," both in *Spain in the Fifteenth Century*. The author himself is also a great admirer of Queen Isabella. He

However, there is another dimension to Isabella's self-fashioning, besides her valorous image, only lightly touched on in Castiglione's work: the image of a faithful wife and devoted mother. Despite being a rare and exceptional woman in her age, Isabella never overlooked the cultivation of the traditional dimensions of womanhood. In particular, the constancy of her love towards Ferdinand was praised frequently, in contrast with her husband's infidelity. Moreover, Isabella's chroniclers, perhaps under her direction again, also represent her as a "very good wife, loyal, true and submissive to her husband." They even disseminated some information jointly, including that the Queen never had a favourite, for her only favourite was her husband; or that Isabella mended her husband's shirts by her own delicate hand.³¹

Furthermore, it was recorded that Isabella exploited womanly pliability to tone down Ferdinand's discontent with his status in Castile and his loss of the right of succession to his wife's kingdom. In the beginning of 1475, Ferdinand disclosed his displeasure at Isabella's sole proprietorship of Castile and argued against the right of succession bypassing him to a child of theirs. Isabella allayed his anger cunningly with wifely conformity: "My lord, there is no reason why you should raise these matters. Where there is that conformity which, by God's grace exists between you and me, there can be no differences. Wherefore, whatever is decided here, you

attributes the golden age of Spain primarily to the Queen, instead of King Ferdinand of Aragon, her husband.

³¹ Cited in Ramón Menéndez Pidal, "The Significance of the Reign of Isabella the Catholic, According to her Contemporaries," 385 and Marvin Lunenfeld, "Isabella I of Castile and the Company of Women in Power," *Historical Reflections*, 4-2 (1977): 219. See also Felipe Fernández-Armesto, *Ferdinand and Isabella* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1975) 106.

as my husband are still king of Castile, and what you command shall be done in this realm.”³² Likewise, Isabella on another occasion declared artfully to her husband that “she would never for any reason have wanted to cause the least humiliation to her most beloved consort, for whose happiness and honour she would sacrifice willingly not only the crown but her own health.”³³ She thus thwarted Ferdinand’s anger and kept him as her great captain in the war against the infidel. The contemporary chronicler, Alfonso de Palencia, thus commented that “the love of his wife, whom he loved deeply, calmed the King’s ire and, obeying his feelings, he assented with good grace to his wife’s entreaties.”³⁴ Nevertheless, even though Isabella demonstrated her allegiance to her husband emphatically, she was never actually willing to give away her political superiority in Castile, nor to allow the rights of matrimony to take precedence over her royal power. In a way, she was maintaining her political power under the mask of women’s softness; and she tactfully manoeuvred the language of the weaker sex without jeopardising the political interests of her own country.³⁵

As evident in humanist works that praised illustrious women and in the real life actions of Isabella of Castile, the ideal model of a Renaissance ruling queen was a woman who exercised political supremacy while not challenging the underlying assumption of gender. Unlike a prince, whose honour and fame were based upon

³² Cited in Fernández-Armesto, *Ferdinand and Isabella*, 13.

³³ Cited in Peggy K. Liss, *Isabel the Queen: Life and Time* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 106.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 107.

³⁵ For the political relationship between Isabella and Ferdinand, and their joint rule, see Chapter 3, section II, in this thesis.

political success and the maintenance of his state, female rulers were also constrained by the strictures of chastity and traditional women's virtues. Although they were extraordinary women in their own age, ruling queens' success did not lie in keeping distant from conventional women's virtues, but consisted in how skilfully they could weave together the two threads of manliness and femininity. Renaissance humanists, indeed, presumed a higher standard for ruling queens than for kings to judge their political success. Kings were usually expected to fulfil their kingly images with heroic virtues, whilst the ruling queens, like career women in our time, were required to perform both private and public virtues. Although some of the humanists had more progressive opinions on women's education, they still maintained the principle of medieval "queenmaking" which concentrated on the queens' feminine virtues, virginity in particular.³⁶

Renaissance ruling queens were actually not viewed as a distinct category from king's wives—the queen consorts, regarding the virtue of chastity and the duty of procreation. Therefore, representations of queen consorts are a good point of reference to understand further sixteenth-century queenly virtues. Two useful cases are the entries to the City of London of Catherine of Aragon, mother of Mary Tudor, and of Anne Boleyn, mother of Elizabeth Tudor. Catherine of Aragon made her entry on 12 November 1501, before she was to celebrate her marriage with Prince Arthur, heir to the throne of England. The themes in Catherine's entry pageants

³⁶ See Joanna L. Chamberlayne, "Crowns and Virgins: Queenmaking during the wars of the Roses," in *Young Medieval Women*, eds. Katherine J. Lewis, Noël James Menuge and Kim M. Philips (Gloucestershire: Sutton Publishing, 1999), 47-68.

which extolled both Catherine and Prince Arthur were very humanist. Their first and foremost concern was in the pursuit of honour which was claimed to be achieved only through a life of virtue.³⁷ Interestingly, however, it was matrimony itself which promoted Catherine's attainment of honour. As the first pageant of her entry displayed, her prime honour was gained by her marriage with God; now she would get "an honour temporall," through her second marriage with Arthur. Furthermore, her success in honour in this Anglo-Spanish marriage relied emphatically on her virtue, the virtue of chastity in particular. Catherine's success was also determined by her procreation of children. The third pageant conveyed this message clearly through the mouth of the allegoric Raphael the Archangel, stating that this marriage was made for love, virtue and reverence, and for the "procreation of chyldyr, afftyr Goddys precept, not ffor Censuall lust and apetyte to be kept."³⁸ The same importance of the queen's fertility was further addressed in the fifth pageant. A person representing the Father of Heaven exhorted Catherine to follow his precepts and he would offer wonderful blessings in return, "Blyssyd be the fruyt of yowyr bely, Yowir substance and frutys I shall encrease and multyply" The Father of Heaven even implied that the fruit of Catherine's body would achieve her own honour and goodness of this realm.³⁹

The issue of producing a male heir was even more pronounced in Queen Anne's coronation pageants on 31 May 1533. Indeed, the marriage between Anne Boleyn

³⁷ See Sydney Anglo, "The London Pageants for the Reception of Katherine of Aragon: November 1501," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 26 (1963): 53-89.

³⁸ Cited in *ibid.*, 57, 67.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 80.

and King Henry VIII signified Catherine's failure in her queenly virtues since giving birth to a male child was viewed as a crucial duty of a queen consort. The pageants of Queen Anne's entry unsurprisingly extolled her beauty and virtues, "coupled with the fervent hope that she would shortly give birth to a male heir."⁴⁰ Accordingly, there were two primary themes in these pageants. One was Anne's virtue of chastity, and the other was the all-important desire for a male heir to perpetuate the dynasty. Particularly in the third pageant, Queen Anne was linked to Saint Anne and three Maries: the Virgin, mother of Christ; Mary Salome, the mother of Zebedee; and Mary Cleophe, wife of Alpheus. All these three Marys symbolised fertility and queenly duty of procreation. In addition, Anne was in the same pageant compared to the bird, white falcon, which was also her family crest, representing beauty, courage, chastity and gentleness. This comparison was then deliberately diverted to the hope that "she may bring Fruit according, For such a Falcon white."⁴¹ Queen Anne was symbolically endowed with an imperial crown in two of the pageants, along with the scene of the Golden Age in Vergilian terms which appeared several times throughout these pageants. For instance, in the second pageant, the personages of Apollo and Nine Muses were set upon a mountain, each of them having their instruments and apparel according to Virgil's description of the Golden

⁴⁰ Sydney Anglo, *Spectacle, Pageantry, and Early Tudor Policy* (Oxford: the Clarendon Press, 1969), 248.

⁴¹ "The Coronation of Anne Boleyn," in E. Arber, *An English Garner, Tudor Tracts, 1532-1588*, XIII (London: Archibald Constable and Co., Ltd., 1877-96), 15-16, 23.

Age.⁴² However, it was strongly suggested that the Golden Age would not come to England until Anne gave birth to a male heir. This message was unambiguously demonstrated in the eighth pageant at St. Paul's gate. There was a long roll written "Queen Anne when thou shalt bear a new son of the King's blood; there shall be a golden world unto thy people." That echoed the oration delivered by a child in the third pageant, which manifested that only by the wonderful birth of a future male heir would people's lives truly be secured and "this City from all dangers preserved;" then people could enjoy "great comfort, joy and solace."⁴³

The connection between the birth of a male heir and the descending of a golden age was similarly brought out in the self-representation of Isabella of Castile, though she was not in fact a queen consort. The birth of Prince Juan in 1478 was viewed as the turning point for Castile, and the people began to have a prophetic expectation of the coming of a new age—the Golden Age. Isabella was therefore bountifully hailed as the Virgin Mary, the mother of Christ and of the Universal Redeemer of the human lineage. She was extolled as "the exemplar of motherhood and embodiment of purity, virtue, piety and compassion." Afterwards she was also compared by contemporary humanists to the Virgin Astraea, whose descent from the sky was prophesied by Virgil as heralding the return of the Golden Age.⁴⁴ Consequently, it

⁴² Besides, the City set up a costly fountain in the fifth pageant, where "white win, claret, and red wine, in great plenty," kept running out in all the afternoon. See "The Coronation of Anne Boleyn," 16.

⁴³ Ibid., 17, 21.

⁴⁴ Liss, *Isabel the Queen*, 158, 256-58. Isabella herself actively involved in this campaign and encouraged her chroniclers to disseminate her image as the Virgin Mary, and also to compare her to Diana, Minerva and the moon, representing her moral purity. See Liss, *Isabel the Queen*, 159 and Woodward, *Spain in the Reigns of Isabella and Ferdinand*, 104.

became a commonplace for both queen consorts and queen regnants to identify themselves with the Virgin Mary and other fertile mothers in the Scriptures, as well as goddesses who represented purity and chastity.

As a whole, both the humanist writings of noteworthy women and the representations of Queen Isabella and two English queen consorts provided the two prospective Tudor ruling queens with the ground of queenly virtues. Humanist writings had exhibited that the ideal queenly virtues was a good combination of masculine and feminine qualities. They also supplied a list of the queen's virtues and prepared a number of famous and powerful women whom could be emulated by later queens or used to present the greatness of the same. As with the queens' representations, these forerunners clearly demonstrated the necessity for future ruling queens to cultivate womanly virtues (particularly their motherhood), and additionally, to identify themselves with the Virgin Mary, women in the Scriptures and classical goddesses.

II. Queen Mary's cultivation of womanly virtues

The remaining of this chapter, grounded in the context of Renaissance queenly virtues, will focus on Mary Tudor's self-fashioning and her representations amongst Catholic supporters. In this section, we will examine the establishment of Mary's womanly virtues, in comparison with the ideal model of queenly virtues which has been laid out above, and pay special attention to her predicament in reconciling

wifely virtues and public obligations. In the next section, we will assess Mary's self-improvement of a pious image, along with the efforts made by her Catholic apologists. In addition, the connection between Mary's image-making and the opinions of those writers of the "mirror-for-princesses" will also be investigated to understand Queen Mary's self-fashioning.

The accession of Mary Tudor is viewed by John King as a new and unprecedented situation for English government in terms of image-making. He suggests that the reigns of Mary and Elizabeth Tudor produced a novel form of "eclectic amalgamation" which mixed "the traditional symbols of kings as defenders of Catholic orthodoxy or Protestant reform" with "the images of powerless queens consort, biblical heroines, female saints, and the Blessed Virgin Mary."⁴⁵ In fact, this manner of eclectic amalgamation had existed before the reigns of these two half-sisters, if viewed in the context of Renaissance perception of queenly virtues. Ruling queens in literature and Isabella of Castile in reality had exemplified the mixture of kingly symbols and womanly qualities. Therefore, the reign of Mary might be truly unprecedented for English people since they had little experience of a female monarchy;⁴⁶ but for men in Mary's government, very likely, they had read or heard the legends of famous women in the past and were familiar with the strategy of the queen's image-making. Hence, they endeavoured to apply the same ceremonies and processions of male kings to the Queen, and simultaneously highlighted the

⁴⁵ John King, *Tudor Royal Iconography: Literature and Art in an Age of Religion Crisis* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989), 53.

⁴⁶ The only precedent of a female ruler in England was the Empress Matilda, see Introduction, note 8.

Queen's womanly qualities in their eulogies.⁴⁷ Generally speaking, Queen Mary and her supporters, consciously or not, followed the pattern of Isabella of Castile's image-making, in efforts to portray the Queen as the defender of Catholic religion and the model of womanly virtues. Both queens even shared the same identity with the Virgin Mary.⁴⁸

However, perhaps because of different historical situations and particularly because of her self-perception, Mary herself displayed far fewer virile virtues and less management of her image than had her grandmother. In particular, Mary demonstrated less competence than Isabella in dealing with the conflict between her public image and private female virtues relating to her role as a wife. Mary was brought up in an atmosphere dominated by humanist program of women's education, represented by her mother's compatriot Vives. Mary's formal education began in 1521, five years after she was born. At the beginning of her education, Mary was guided earnestly by her parents. According to Garrett Mattingly, while Henry supervised her music, Catherine, "who taught her A B C, guided her childish pen, ordered her reading, and corrected her Latin exercises," then took the primary charge of her daughter's humanist learning.⁴⁹ Catherine's instruction of her daughter made much reference to Vives' programme of women's reading and domestic training, although she also amalgamated some aspects of traditional training of a court lady, such as music and dancing. Vives's idea of women's upbringing was exhibited in

⁴⁷ For Queen Mary's coronation entry, see Chapter 4, section I.

⁴⁸ In fact, it had been rather common to compare English queens to the Virgin Mary since the late Middle Ages. See Chamberlayne, "Crowns and Virgins," 53, 56-57.

⁴⁹ Garrett Mattingly, *Catherine of Aragon* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1942), 140.

De institutione feminae christianae which was written in 1523 and dedicated to Catherine. This work was translated into English by Richard Hyrde as *The Instruction of a Christian Woman* in 1540 and was considered the most influential conduct book for women of the sixteenth century.⁵⁰ Vives also wrote another manual, *De ratione studii puerilis*, for Catherine to aid the education of Princess Mary in the same year.

The framework of Vives's education of women is designed for three stages of woman's life: maidenhood, wifehood and widowhood. Although he outlines an early education for girls parallel with that suggested for boys in his *De tradendis disciplinis* (Antwerp, 1531), he is anxious to point out women's weaker nature: "woman is a frail thing, and of weak discretion, and that may lightly be deceived which thing our first mother Eve sheweth."⁵¹ Thus, he imposes great limitations on women's reading, prohibiting the chivalrous romances and books concerned with matters of love and war in vulgar tongue. Moreover, instruction in reading and writing are to be combined with domestic arts like needlework and cooking which are thought as a sign of honesty and chastity and useful in keeping women from idleness. Vives's idea of women's education stresses manifestly that women should be sheltered in pure and chaste life, segregated from the other sex and public activities; therefore, she learns "for her self alone and her young children, or her sisters in our lord," and should not rule a school or live among men or speak abroad

⁵⁰ Ruth Kelso, *Doctrine for the Lady of the Renaissance* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1956), 71-74.

⁵¹ Vives, *The Instruction*, 56.

or shake off her demureness and honesty.⁵² Moreover, the art of rhetoric was to be omitted from the program of study for girls, for “eloquence is not convenient nor fit for women.”⁵³

Education is clearly not intended by Vives to enable a woman to function in the professional world, and it was certainly not meant to aid her in becoming a ruler. In fact, the end of women’s education for Vives is to help women to fulfil their social function in the family and perform their domestic role as a wife or a mother. As for the bond of matrimony, Vives’ treatise makes it clear that wives must obey their husband’s will and guide, “if they would learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home.”⁵⁴ Despite the fact that Mary was an heir to the crown, Vives never encourages Catherine in his works to train Mary as a ruler who needed to leave her private chamber and speak in public; all her learning in languages and writings should not be merely ornament, but daily necessity. Nevertheless, Catherine, to a great degree, adopted Vives’ idea regarding women’s nature, women’s virtues of chastity and modesty, and particularly wifely obedience to her husband, in the training of her daughter. Therefore, the tendency of Vives’s educational thought had great influence on Mary’s self-perception, viewing her final destination as a wife and mother, instead of a sovereign—to be man’s helping hand rather than his head. Moreover, Vives’ stress on silence, obedience and chastity might also foster Mary’s eagerness to cultivate womanly virtues.

⁵² Ibid., 55.

⁵³ Vives, *De officio marti*, in *Vives and the Renaissance Education of Women*, 206.

⁵⁴ Vives, *The Instruction*, 55-56.

Aside from her education, another influence on Mary's self-fashioning might come from Charles V, the Emperor, who was Catherine's nephew and a close kinsman to Mary. Charles deliberately played the role of Mary's guide in her marriage and religion as soon as Mary was a Princess, and afterwards became her spiritual father.⁵⁵ He admonished Mary in the very beginning of her reign to display herself as a "good Englishwoman" without showing any desire for power:

Let her be in all things what she ought to be: a good Englishwoman, and avoid giving the impression that she desires to act on her own authority, letting it be seen that she wished to have the assistance and consent of the foremost men of the land.⁵⁶

Despite the fact that Charles's grandmother, Isabella of Castile, and his mother, Juana of Castile, both were queen regnants, his conception of women's virtue and duty was very conventional, declaring that "the labour of government could with difficulty be undertaken by a woman, and was not within woman's province."⁵⁷ The Emperor unsurprisingly suggested to the Queen that she bend her will to the foremost men of England, and find a husband as soon as possible "in order to be supported in the labour of governing and assisted in matters that are not of ladies' capacity."⁵⁸ However, after Mary's marriage with Philip, Prince of Spain, Mary encountered more obstacles in her image-making. Her dealing with the intricate relationship with King Philip and her failure in motherhood finally crippled Mary's ability to pursue a perfect image of Renaissance ruling queens.

⁵⁵ More see Chapter 5, section I.

⁵⁶ The Emperor to the Ambassadors in England, 22 July 1553, *CSP Sp.*, XI, 111, 110.

⁵⁷ The Ambassadors in England to the Emperor, 2 August 1553, *CSP Sp.*, XI, 131.

⁵⁸ The Emperor to his Ambassadors in England, 22 July 1553, *CSP Sp.*, XI, 111.

i. Queen Mary as the Virgin Mary

Among the sources Mary herself left us, the most important is her oration delivered against Wyatt's rebellion in the Guildhall on 1 February 1554. This speech contained a clear message of the Queen's own self-representation with particular focus on her womanly virtues. First, she extended the relationship between a ruler and her realm/subjects to be one between a wife and a husband, as she stated that "I am your queen, to whom at my coronation, when I was wedded to the realm and laws of the same; the spousal ring where of I have on my finger, which never hitherto was, nor hereafter shall be left off." Mary then advanced a ruler's care of the people to a mother's love towards her children, saying that

I cannot tell how naturally the mother loveth the child, for I was never the mother of any; but certainly, if a prince and governor may as naturally and earnestly love her subjects, as the mother doth love the child, then assure yourselves, that I, being your lady and mistress, do as earnestly and tenderly love and favour you.⁵⁹

Subsequently, Mary singled out her virtue of chastity as a pure virgin. She stressed that her choice of a husband was not out of any personal lust, and she was not even desirous of matrimony. She remarked that "I have hitherto lived a virgin, and doubt nothing, but with God's grace, I am able so to live still." Finally, she ended her statement of self-representation with a hope of real motherhood, to produce a child by her marriage with a Spanish Prince. Queen Mary thus projected her main duty to be the same as that of queen consort: giving birth to a male heir. She knew that her

⁵⁹ Foxe, VI, 414.

people would agree that the birth of a male heir was the all-important queenly duty. Therefore she declared that “as my progenitors have done before, it may please God that I might leave some fruit of my body behind me, to be your governor, I trust you would not only rejoice thereat, but also I know it would be to your great comfort.”⁶⁰

In the case of chastity, not only was it acclaimed by the Queen herself, but also generally celebrated as the predominant virtue of Queen Mary by most Catholics. Before his return to England, Cardinal Reginald Pole wrote of Mary in a letter to Stephen Gardiner, the Lord Chancellor and Bishop of Winchester, as “the good saint, the Queen, fair as the moon, whom God hath not suffered to be tainted with any spot, either of schism or of heresy, maintaining over her spirit the full splendour of the Sun of Righteousness, to diffuse and communicate it afterward by means of her throughout the entire realm.”⁶¹ The moon which Reginald Pole analogised to Mary was an important symbol of women’s chastity, as Diana, the goddess of the moon, was usually utilised as the sign of virginity. In addition, the moon was normally identified with the Virgin Mary (while the sun was identified with Christ), and particularly from the late fifteenth century, the Virgin Mary standing on the moon became a standard icon of the Immaculate Conception (Figure 1).⁶² Queen Mary was consequently like the moon and the Virgin Mary, inspired by God, and bending the beams of the sun to nourish her people.

⁶⁰ Ibid., 415.

⁶¹ Cardinal Pole to Stephen Gardiner, 22 March 1554, in *The Letter of Stephen Gardiner*, ed. James Arthur Muller (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1970), 499-500.

⁶² Marina Warner, *Alone of All Her Sex: the Myth and Cult of the Virgin Mary* (London: Quarter Books, 1978), 257.

Indeed, the most noteworthy means to highlight Mary's chastity was through the obvious analogy with the Virgin Mary. However, recent voluminous studies of Elizabeth's identity with the Virgin Mary have somehow overshadowed the fact that Mary Tudor was the first English ruling queen to employ the cult of the Virgin Mary. More importantly, the cult of the Virgin Mary, by its extensively privileged position in the Catholic tradition, would have the effect of reinforcing Mary's religious restoration in England. The fact that Mary Tudor was named after the mother of Christ made it very natural and convenient to compare her to the Virgin Mary. This allusion was soon widespread after Mary took the crown of England in 1553. For instance, many Catholics, both in England and the continent, acclaimed her "a mirror of these virtues" of mercy and sobriety, and styled her as "Mary the Virgin."⁶³ In addition, in a sermon made in a convocation of October 1553, John Harpsfield, the Bishop of London's Chaplain, compared the Queen to the Virgin Mary as well as to several good women in Scripture such as Judith, Esther and Deborah. He specifically made the connection between Queen Mary and the Virgin Mary in order to spotlight Mary's piety and purity. Harpsfield declared that "a virgin arose in England" to waken the true religion from dark, "elect and chosen of God, and by him most gloriously magnified in our eyes: so that she may sing with the virgin Mary, the mother of God."⁶⁴ Parallel to Queen Mary's symbolism of religious restoration was her role seen as the female redeemer specially inspired by God to advance the true

⁶³ Strype, III, part I, 18-19.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 60-61.

religion and Catholic church. At this point, Mary was further linked with the virgin Church. For instance, Dr. Hugh Weston, Dean of Westminster, sang the praise of Queen Mary that “a virgin Queen, like some dove sent down from heaven, should be by the great and good God bestowed upon the virgin Church; by whose conduct and influence all these miseries should be restraine, dissipated, and driven away.”⁶⁵

The praise of Queen Mary’s virtue of chastity by her resemblance to a Virgin Queen was even more conspicuous after her marriage with Philip. Cardinal Pole in his speech on the opening day of Mary’s first parliament of November 1554, continued to praise Mary’s chastity with the image of a virgin:

see how miraculously God of his goodness preserved her highness, contrary to the expectation of man, that when numbers conspired against her, and policies were devised to disinherit her, and armed power prepared to destroy her; yet she, being a virgin helpless, naked, and unarmed, prevailed, and had the victory of tyrants.⁶⁶

Pole attributed the Queen’s miraculous survival to the grace of God. Nevertheless, he implied that her purity and chastity as a virgin could more easily gain divine support. In other words, the virtue of chastity was the primary and indispensable quality of a ruling queen. Pole further analogised the alliance of Mary and Philip with that of the Virgin Mary and Christ. In his letter to the Pope, Pole styled Philip as Christ, “being heir of the world, was sent down by his Father from the regal seat to be spouse and son of the Virgin, and by this means to comfort all mankind.” Although Philip came to be Mary’s husband, Cardinal Pole deliberately portrayed

⁶⁵ Ibid., 68.

⁶⁶ Foxe, VI, 570.

Philip as Christ the son by saying that Philip would “so behaveth himself as though he were a son” of Queen Mary, the Virgin.⁶⁷ Mary’s association with the Virgin Mary was made more explicit in her visual imagery. The first Plea Roll portrait of Queen Mary shows that she wore her hair loose under a crown, an obvious symbol of virginity which was invariably used in images of the Virgin Mary herself (Figure 2). Even after the marriage, Mary kept wearing her hair flowing loose in several portraits with King Philip, which conspicuously implied the images of the Virgin Mary and Christ (Figure 3, 4).

The image of the Virgin Mary itself had manifold connotations. She was the Queen of Heaven, a symbol of regal power and supremacy; she was the moon, and the Church. She was a pure virgin, a divine mother, and an intercessor between God and Christian people. More significantly, from the middle ages the figure of the Virgin Mary gradually became a mirror of “the feminine ideal of the Catholic ethic/virtues”: obedience, chastity, charity and patience.⁶⁸ Along with that, there had been a long tradition since medieval times of praising queen consorts as the blessed Virgin Mary, by claiming their feminine virtues (especially chastity), fertility, and their role as the intercessor between kings and subjects. Consequently, the queens’ semblance of the Virgin Mary had been exploited as a signification of feminine virtues, such as in Anne Boleyn’s coronation pageantry, rather than in connection with princely power with which Mary Tudor was endowed. There was

⁶⁷ Ibid., 574.

⁶⁸ Warner, *Alone of All Her Sex*, 185; for details see, 182-191.

no evidence to show that Mary or her supporters used this image of the Virgin Mary differently from past queen consorts. The centrality of the Virgin Mary in Queen Mary's self-representation just displayed her preoccupied cultivation of womanly virtues, instead of princely virtues. Indeed, the use of the symbol of the Virgin Mary was not a perfect strategy to fulfil the pursuit of the ideal queenly virtues, since it was primarily concerned with ideal femininity. Even though the Virgin Mary could be a forceful symbol of power, as the Queen of Heaven, however, it was predominantly used to reinforce the authority of the pope and the Church.⁶⁹

ii. Queen Mary's motherhood

One of the main aspects of Mary's cultivation of womanly virtues was the image of a mother. Actually, not only did she want to be the symbolic mother of all English people; more eagerly she desired to be a real mother to give birth to a child. That fervent anticipation was undoubtedly shared by her Catholic supporters since the future tranquillity of the realm and religion relied on it. In May 1554, when Robert Wingfield was going to end his story of *Vita Mariae angliae reginae*, he expressed his wish for a future royal child, which expressed precisely the fervent wish of the Queen and her supporters:

everyone was daily expecting the arrival in our island of that most longed-for Spaniard, our king to be. . . . I use all my energy to pray, beseech and implore God the Greatest and Best that this prince . . . may obtain a happy and safe landing with all his people, and very soon will enter the beloved . . . embraces of our most honourable queen; and that some day, God willing, that pure and fertile womb will be made fruitful through the most noble seed

⁶⁹ See *ibid.*, 105-06.

of all Europe, and will render her the joyful mother of a manifold progeny, so that from the marriage bed of such parents there will spring forth a native prince who will match the praises of his ancestors, and will rule over the men of England, France and the Low Countries with the utmost felicity.”⁷⁰

As early as mid-September, 1554, one of Mary’s physicians had told Renard that the Queen was “very probably with child.”⁷¹ Although it had not been verified, Renard spread the rumour immediately and more letters were written by imperial ambassadors to confirm this news in November.⁷² Despite the fact that the rejoicing of Spaniards and English Catholics was obvious, Mary’s pregnancy was actually shrouded in suspicions and some people were convinced that it was a calculated rumour to promote Philip’s coronation.⁷³

The news of the Queen’s pregnancy facilitated Mary’s representation as the Virgin Mary, suggesting that she was going to deliver a Christ-like male child. Cardinal Pole clearly saw a parallel between the Virgin Mary and Queen Mary in this respect:

What a savour of myrrh and frankincense doth she give forth unto her people, who (as the prophet saith of the mother of Christ) brought forth, before she laboured; before she was delivered, brought forth a man-child.⁷⁴

Likewise, a series of processions, masses and prayers celebrating the news of Mary’s pregnancy also associated the Queen with the Virgin Mary. One of the prayers

⁷⁰ Robert Wingfield, “The *Vita Mariae Angliae Reginae* of Robert Wingfiel of Brantham,” in *Camden Miscellany*, 28, trans. Diarmaid MacCulloch (London: the Royal Historical Society, 1984), 292-93.

⁷¹ Cited in E. Harris Harbison, *Rival Ambassadors at the Court of Queen Mary* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1940), 206.

⁷² See Dr. Wotton to the Council, 10 November 1554, *CSP For.*, 137; Peter Vannes to Sir William Petre, 25 November 1554, *CSP For.*, 140.

⁷³ Harbison, *Rival Ambassadors*, 207.

⁷⁴ Foxe, VI, 574.

begged God to sanctify Queen Mary with her pregnancy as he had done to “the blessed Virgin and mother Mary in her conception.”⁷⁵ The utilising of the image of a virgin is presented in another prayer in 1555 which made an appeal to God that

When thou didst please man to restore,
With thee to reign alway,
Thou didst not loth, either abhor,
The Virgin’s womb that day.
No more do now withdraw thy grace,
We humbly thee require;
Our queen inhabit in like case
With grace her to inspire.”⁷⁶

In addition, a prayer of 1554 praised the Queen’s chastity for the purpose of gaining God’s special favour as he had granted to some married but chaste women in Scripture who delivered children in old age.

It is well known to us, how marvellously thou didst work in Sarah of the age of ninety years, and in Elizabeth, the barren, and also far stricken in age: for thy counsel is not in the power of men. Thou Lord, that art the searcher of hearts and thoughts, thou knowest that thy servant [Mary Tudor] never lusted after man, never gave herself to wanton company, nor made herself partaker with them that walk in lightness: but she consented to take a husband with thy fear, and not with her lust. Thou knowest that thy servant took a husband not for carnal pleasure, but only for the desire and love of posterity, wherein thy name might be blessed for ever and ever.⁷⁷

Thus Mary was presented increasingly as the earthly counterpart of the Virgin Mary, and the embodiment of feminine virtues, by the chance of her pregnancy.

However, Mary’s pregnancy gradually became a mystery, along with many other kinds of rumours spread over England and abroad. In the beginning of May 1555,

⁷⁵ Ibid., VI, 584.

⁷⁶ Ibid., VII, 125.

⁷⁷ Ibid., VI, 583.

both the English ambassador in the Netherlands, Thomas Gresham, and Venetian ambassador in England, Giovanni Michel, reported that the Queen had safely delivered a male child on 30 April. English people hence celebrated this news on the day with extreme joy by processions, banquets, bonfires and ringing bells in many parts of England; also in Antwerp, guns were shot off upon the river by the English ships.⁷⁸ Several preachers even fervently “describe[d] the proportion of the child, how fair, how beautiful, and great a prince it was,” nevertheless, this news was finally proved to be false and there was not such a royal child.⁷⁹ Many negative rumours were spread afterwards, one of which suggested that the Queen was delivered “a mole or lump of flesh, and was in great peril of death.”⁸⁰ Moreover, according to John Foxe, “some said this rumour of the queen’s conception was spread for a policy; some others affirmed that she was deceived by a tympany, or some other like disease, to think herself with child, and was not; some thought she was with child, and that it did by some chance miscarry, or else that she was bewitched.” Foxe also reported what he himself heard from a woman whose new-born son was taken away from her by the Lord North on 11 June. He suggested that that child was probably used as the Queen’s new-born son by those people from the court.⁸¹ Feeling deceived, by the summer of 1555, the mood in England became one of increasing despair. According to Giovanni Michiel, Venetian Ambassador in England, the hope of a childbirth “has so diminished that but little reliance can now

⁷⁸ See Thomas Gresham to the Council, 4 May, 1555, *CSP For.*, 165-66; Giovanni Michiel to the Doge and Senate, 6 May 1555, *CSP Ven.*, VI, 60-61.

⁷⁹ Foxe, VII, 126.

⁸⁰ Sir Philip Hoby to Sir John Masone, 6 June 1555, *CSP For.*, 173.

be any longer placed on it;" he therefore concluded that "the pregnancy will end in wind rather than anything else."⁸² Foxe also pointed out that "the people were certified, that the queen neither was as then delivered, nor after was in hope to have any child."⁸³

All did become clear in the end that the Queen had not successfully delivered a child. None the less, those diverse rumours circulating amongst the English people with their disappointment might have undermined Mary's image and rule to a great degree. The spread of prophecies and rumours frequently upset political order and royal authority in the Tudor age as G. R. Elton has indicated.⁸⁴ Those negative rumours about Mary's pregnancy, no matter whether they originated from innocent anxiety or sinister purpose, wrecked Mary's government propaganda which claimed that her pregnancy, as the Virgin Mary's, was blessed by God. Mary's frustrated pregnancy, however, came to imply that her marriage did not obtain divine favour, or could even be viewed as a token of God's anger upon the English people, as her reign had been proclaimed so by Mary's Protestant opponents.⁸⁵

Not producing an heir itself brought out some negative impact on Mary's self-representation. First, Mary's failure in motherhood greatly damaged the prestige of her representation as the Virgin Queen, since maternity itself had been so central to

⁸¹ Foxe, VII, 126.

⁸² Giovanni Michiel to the Doge and Senate, 5 August 1555, *CSP Ven.*, VI, part II, 147, 147-48.

⁸³ Foxe, VII, 126.

⁸⁴ See G. R. Elton, *Policy and Police: the Enforcement of the Reformation in the Age of Thomas Cromwell* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972), Chapter 2.

⁸⁵ Christopher Goodman, *How Superior Powers ought to be Obeyd of their subiects, and wherein they may lawfully by Gods worde be disobeyed and resisted* (Geneva, 1558, *STC* 12020; reprinted in Amsterdam: Theatrum Orbis Terrarum Ltd., 1972), sig. C1v-2r.

the cult of the latter. Mary's image of the Virgin Mary therefore could not be realised as completely as her grandmother, Isabella of Castile, who gave birth to Prince Juan. Second, regarding her rule, Mary lost a chance to reinforce her image of a careful and peaceful ruler which could be readily transformed from her motherly love to her son. It is noteworthy that several powerful French queen mothers and regents, including Queen Blanche of Castile, mother of King Louis IX, Louise of Savoy, mother of King Francis I, and Catherine de Medici, mother of King Charles IX and Henry III, were frequently styled as the Virgin Mary. They were situated in the similar bond between mother and son to the Virgin Mary and Christ, while their regal power was normally justified on the grounds of maternity. For instance, the Scottish supporter of Catherine de Medici, David Chambers, ardently defended the queen mother's right of ruling on the basis of her motherhood. He argued that maternal love would lead a woman to rule wisely:

According to written and natural reason, the mother loves her children more with an affectionate love, and has a sweeter and more tender heart, in order to nourish lovingly and carefully guard their bodies and their goods, than any other person, however close to them in lineage.⁸⁶

Mary Tudor, sadly, did not have this chance to sanctify further her regal power by the image of the Virgin Mary and mother. However, if Mary could endeavour to

⁸⁶ David Chambers, *Discours de la légitime succession des femmes* (Paris, 1579), sig. 26v-27r; cited in Rachel Weil, "The Crown has Fallen to the Distaff: Gender and Politics in the Age of Catherine de Medici, 1560-1589," *Critical Matrix* 1-4 (1985): 9.

Similarly, Barthélemy Chasseneuz and his pupil Charles Grassaille brought out the sanctity of maternal devotion in the 1530s to argue that Louise of Savoy by virtue of her authority as "the king's mother" was entitled to have the highest honour and exercise regal power. See Elizabeth McCartney, "The King's Mother and Royal Prerogative in Early-Sixteen-Century France," in *Medieval Queenship*, ed. John Carmi Parsons (Stroud: Sutton, 1994), 139.

explore, as Elizabeth would do, the range of possibilities of a symbolic and natural mother of all the English people, something Mary herself had taken steps towards in her oration against Wyatt's rebellion in 1554, this failure probably would not have been too significant. None the less, Mary's loss of a child actually decreased her capacity of presenting the ideal queenly virtues afterwards. She seemed to just fall down in self-pity and heartbreak with the twofold blows of her frustration in childbirth and the departure of her husband in August 1555.

iii. Queen Mary's wifhood

Mary's whole self-representation as a ruling queen was considerably limited by her wifhood. Before her marriage, the praise of Mary's heroic virtues was more pronounced than after the marriage. For instance, it was demonstrated in the magnificent pageant set up by the Florentines in her coronation entry on 30 September 1553. There Queen Mary was identified with heroic Judith who liberated the Hebrews from the tyranny of Holofernes, and also with Toymris who had led her people to vanquish Cyrus, both of whom were the representatives of women's virile virtues.⁸⁷

Mary's masculine image decreased tremendously after the marriage, and her husband Philip was presumed to take over the place of the incarnation of heroic virtues. Philip's first image in England was displayed in his entry with Queen Mary into London on 18 August 1554. There were several pageants designed by the City

⁸⁷ Anglo, *Spectacle*, 320-21.

in this entry, held after their marriage ceremonies on 25 July. Unlike the entry of Catherine of Aragon in 1501, these pageants principally focused on the king consort alone. Significantly, Philip was compared by the second pageant in his entry to four famous Philips: Philip King of Macedonia, Philip the Roman Emperor, Philip Duke of Burgundy (surnamed “Bonus”), and Philip Duke of Burgundy (surnamed “Audax”). The pageant connected Philip with his ancestors to eulogise his glory and fame, adding praise for his qualities of wisdom, justice and courage.⁸⁸ Similar virtues of Philip were hailed by Cardinal Pole in his speech to the parliament. He compared Philip to Solomon and extolled his kingly virtues—“great might, armour and force,” while praising the Queen as the “helpless, naked, and unarmed” virgin.⁸⁹

Mary herself inclined to search for the improvement of wifely virtues after the marriage, especially the duty of obedience. Contrary to the mode of Isabella of Castile and Ferdinand of Aragon, Mary willingly supported the Spanish request to have Philip named before Mary in their royal titles.⁹⁰ Robert Wingfield indicated that “the queen’s conjugal love for the king” was made clear to everyone in the

⁸⁸ The entry of Mary and Philip was reported in details by John Elder’s *The Copie of a Letter Sent into Scotland, of the ariuall and marryage of Philippe, prynce of Spaine to Marye quene of England* (London: J. Waylande, 1555, STC 7552), which is reprinted in *Queen Jane and Queen Mary*, 136-66.

⁸⁹ Foxe, VI, 570.

⁹⁰ The royal titles of Philip and Mary was issued in 25 July 1554 as “Philip and Mary by the grace of God King and Queen of England, France, Naples, Jerusalem, and Ireland; Defenders of the Faith, Princes of Spain and Sicily; Archdukes of Austria; Dukes of Milan, Burgundy, and Brabant; Counts of Hapsburg, Flanders, and Tyrol.” *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, II, 45-46. In contrast, Isabella of Castile took precedence over King Ferdinand in their royal titles. In 1475, Ferdinand even found that the chancery returned letters of homage to Seville for correction only because they named the King before the Queen; “he informed Isabel that he was deeply offended in honour and reputation, that people saw his virility undercut, and that he was leaving for Aragon.” Even though Ferdinand was extremely angry, Isabella insisted that it was all a formal legal matter. See Liss, *Isabel the Queen*, 106.

discussion of this issue. Wingfield furthermore hailed the Queen's wifely obedience in this case, which clearly demonstrated her subordination to divine law:

This was indeed an uncommon proof, not to say extremely uncommon, and by far the most renowned token of obedience which such a princess might show to her husband. . . . Through the sharing of the most famous title of such mighty kingdoms, everyone might see more clearly than daylight that the subjection of wives to their menfolk so often ordered and emphasised by St Paul and the other Apostles was held in high esteem in the queen's sacred conscience.⁹¹

Ironically, St. Paul's teaching of women's subjection was also commonly accentuated in Protestants' polemical writings against Mary's rule and her foreign match.⁹² Queen Mary was not the earthly Virgin Mary any longer in the pamphlets written by Marian exiles such as Thomas Becon, Christopher Goodman and John Knox. On the contrary, Mary was the incarnation of those cruel, heinous, licentious queens in Scripture, such as Queen Jezebel, Queen Athalia and Queen Herodias. Her wifely obedience was expediently singled out as the evidence of foreign domination, as John Knox angrily condemned that the "monstre Marie" betrayed the liberty of England and subjected it to the hands of Spaniards.⁹³ Protestant attacks on Mary's marriage reflected popular fear of foreign infiltration, and also manifested the dilemma associated with a ruling queen between her marriage and the independence of her native country.⁹⁴ More significantly, it indicated the necessity for a queen regnant to pursue a balance between her private role and her public duty,

⁹¹ Wingfield, "The *Vita Mariae*," 291-92.

⁹² See Chapters 3, section IV, and Chapter 5, section IV.

⁹³ John Knox, *The First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrous Regiment of Women*, in *The Works of John Knox*, VI, ed. David Laing (Edinburgh: James Thin, 1845; reprint, New York: AMS Press, 1966), 411.

⁹⁴ See Part III of this thesis.

between her cultivation of womanly virtues and her image as a powerful ruler. In any case, Mary learned nothing from those defiant Protestants' loud outcry, or perhaps she just ignored them.

Mary exhibited more willingness to obey her husband's will in the subsequent controversy of Philip's coronation from 1555 to 1556. King Philip's position in England had attained greater affirmation before the marriage with the protection of the treason law passed in April 1554; and after the marriage, he successfully gained the regency of the child in January 1555 in case the Queen died.⁹⁵ His final goal was to have himself crowned in order to secure and enhance his position in England further. Coincidentally, when Philip started pressing for his coronation in September 1555, he had to leave England because his father, Charles V, had decided to resign the lordship of the Netherlands as well as the crowns of Aragon and Castile to him. He therefore left the campaign for his coronation with Mary and put great pressure on her to allow him to be crowned. Mary herself certainly wished Philip to play a dominant role in the government and wanted to see her husband's constitutional position to be strengthened. However, Philip's long absence imposed an immense strain on Mary's self-fashioning.

Philip's first departure from England was on 27 August 1555 and he refused to return until March 1557. His second leave started in July 1557 and he did not even go back to England at the moment of Mary's death. Philip's long absence

⁹⁵ See Jennifer Loach, *Parliament and the Crown in the Reign of Mary Tudor* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), 97-98, 117-22

undoubtedly annoyed Mary's subjects, for Philip's action clearly demonstrated his heartlessness about English affairs. Particularly for those who had opposed this foreign match, Philip's attitude embodied the falseness of Mary's marriage. Obviously, Philip learned nothing from Erasmus's "mirror-for-princes" which was addressed to his father, stating that "nothing alienated the people's affection from a prince as much as when he enjoys going abroad, because they seem to be being neglected by the one whom they wish to be especially concerned for them." The majority of English people probably did not care about this foreign King's concern, and English Protestants might be even glad to get rid of Philip. Yet, his absence considerably stirred popular discontent with him, as Erasmus warned those princes who journeyed far away from the country that the people would "regard the tax revenue that is exacted from them as being lost to themselves, . . . and they do not think of it as being given to the prince but as being thrown away as plunder for foreigners."⁹⁶

None the less, the saddest person was the tragic Queen, who "sensing the disappointment of all her hopes as a woman and Queen," kept back her tears only until she was alone in an upper room of the palace at Greenwich" on the day of Philip's first leave.⁹⁷ The insurmountable sorrow and solitude at her husband's

⁹⁶ Erasmus, *The Education of a Christian Prince*, 256.

⁹⁷ Cited in Harbison, *Rival Ambassadors*, 259. The Venetian ambassador, Giovanni Michel also reported that the Queen "remains disconsolate, though she conceals it as much as she can, and from what I hear mourns the more when alone and supposing herself invisible to any of her attendants." Giovanni Michel to the Doge and Senate, 27 August 1555, *CSP Ven.*, VI, part I, 174. More about the Queen's grief for the King's absence was revealed in Cardinal Pole's letters to Philip, which were written in behalf of Mary, see *CSP Ven.*, VI, part I, 190, 245-46.

absence, hindered the Queen from any energetic image-making. She fell into distress and passionately appealed for Philip's return. Mary wrote several letters to Philip's father to beg his permission for his son's return to England (in fact, to a greater degree, this depended on Philip's own willingness). In these letters, she not only reminded the Emperor of the importance of the King's presence in England, but also frankly expressed her own deep misery,

I implore your Majesty most humbly, for the love of God, to do all that is possible to permit it, . . . I beg your Majesty to forgive my boldness, and to remember the unspeakable sadness I experience because of the absence of the King, which emboldens me thus to write to you.

Sire, . . . although I place your Majesty's prosperity and honour first of all, I cannot but deeply feel the solitude in which the King's absence leaves me. As your Majesty well knows, he is the chief joy and comfort I have in this world. Therefore, I can only desire that he may return here as soon as the state of affairs permits.⁹⁸

Indeed, Mary was more incapable than ever of ruling in the summer of 1556 because of the long strain of ill-health and emotional frustration. When Don Francisco de Mendoza came in July to say that Philip would be in England within six weeks, Mary lost her self-control, saying angrily that "it was nothing but mere promises and ineffective words." It was also reported that the Queen "has been seen scratching the portraits of her husband the King of Spain which she keeps in her room."⁹⁹

Nevertheless, Mary continually wrote letters to the Emperor to indicate the difficulty in dealing with political affairs alone. She told the Emperor that "unless he [Philip] comes to remedy matters, not I only but also wiser persons than I fear that

⁹⁸ Mary I to the Emperor, 6 April 1556; the same to the same May 1556, *CSP Sp.*, XIII, 260, 267.

⁹⁹ Gilles de Noailles to Montmorency, 30 June 1556, cited from Harbison, *Rival Ambassadors*, 301.

great danger will ensue for lack of a firm hand, and indeed we see it before our eyes.”¹⁰⁰ Mary had apparently lacked the confidence to be “a firm hand” herself. Neither was she capable of evaporating the “violent opposition” to Philip’s coronation in the parliament.¹⁰¹ In the parliament of October 1555, Mary was so irritated by the parliament’s opposition to the settlement of Philip’s crown that she had even thought to dissolve it. Nevertheless, Mary’s action was bridled by the parliament, and ultimately, Philip’s pursuit of coronation was completely thwarted, which has been viewed as the parliament’s “great triumph” by Jennifer Loach.¹⁰²

Philip’s absence broke Mary’s heart; more significantly, it engendered a weak and very feminine image of the English Queen. The queen’s wifely love was brought into conflict with her duties towards her people’s will when Philip imposed the question of coronation upon Mary. Critically for Mary, her oscillations between a private love and her public role must only have persuaded her people of her feebleness in English political affairs. During the later half of 1556 and 1557, another chance arose for Mary to restyle herself when Philip requested the Queen to draw England into his war with France. Yet despite the fact that both the Council

¹⁰⁰ Mary I to the Emperor, 10 September 1556, *CSP Sp.*, XIII, 276.

¹⁰¹ Giovanni Michel to the Doge and Senate, 27 October 1555, *CSP Ven.*, VI, part I, 227. David Loades indicates an interesting situation between Mary and Philip on the issue of the King’s coronation that “Mary, . . . was trying to use the coronation as an inducement to Philip to go back to England. He [Philip] was probably using its non-fulfilment as an excuse to stay where he was, thinking that he would also lose face if he returned with his conditions unsatisfied.” See David Loades, “Philip II and the government of England,” in *Law and Government Under the Tudors, Essays Presented to Sir Geoffrey Elton on His Retirement*, eds. Claire Cross, David Loades and J. J. Scarisbrick (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 180.

The case of Philip’s coronation also caused great suspicion and hostility towards Spanish domination in England, it even gave rise to the Dudley’s conspiracy in 1556. For this conspiracy see Harbison, *Rival Ambassadors*, 277-89; D. M. Loades, “Dudley’s conspiracy: October 1555- March 1556,” in *Two Tudor Conspiracies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965).

¹⁰² Loach, *Parliament and the Crown*, 196, 173.

and London merchants loathed the order, Mary remained determined to take her husband's side and assist him with every resource at her command.¹⁰³ Mary thus once again showed her wifely loyalty in the debate of war, regardless of her people's will and welfare.

Unlike Isabella of Castile, Mary let her private role supersede her public duty, and sacrificed her public appearance of a careful ruler to serve an image of a devoted wife. She even went to persuade her Council by soft words of her divine duty of obedience to her husband when she summoned the Council to her room on 1 April 1557. In a speech to the Councillors, in the presence of her husband, Mary

expounded to them the obedience which she owed her husband and the power which he had over her as much by divine as by human law, citing to them many examples from the Old and New Testament, and begged them to consider the greatness and prosperity of the kingdom of France, which was already menacing the whole world.¹⁰⁴

Some examples of good women's love and obedience to their husbands in Scripture may have been enough to prove woman's virtue and worth; nevertheless, it would also be detrimental to the Queen's independence. While Mary cited such examples to support her determination, she was binding herself to the frame of patriarchal institutions. In conclusion, compared to the ideal queenly virtues of the sixteenth century, Mary's whole self-fashioning concentrated overwhelmingly on the cultivation of womanly virtues (particularly after her marriage), which eventually proved to lead only to failure.

¹⁰³ For the people's opposition to the war, see Harbison, *Rival Ambassadors*, 303-29.

¹⁰⁴ Cited in *ibid.*, 323.

III. Fashioning the godly Queen and mother

Christian virtues (or godliness) were another important dimension to Queen Mary's self-representation, coinciding with the Queen's recalcitrant determination to restore the old religion. Importantly, in a new reign after the Reformation of her father and brother, Mary's devotion to the virtue of religion would reinforce the move to restore Catholicism and its traditional rituals. Her identification with the Virgin Mary was therefore a central part of the rehabilitation of Catholic belief and rituals promoted by Marian government. Another significant strategy for Mary to display her virtue of piety is through a revival of the miraculous "royal touch." Mary was the first English queen to perform the ceremonies of royal touch and, according to Marc Bloch's famous study, she executed this highly symbolic ritual in accordance with all the rules which had already been "followed by the last Catholic kings before the Reformation."¹⁰⁵

Mary performed this wonder-working power of sacred kings at least twice in her reign. The first one was in March 1554, according to Simon Renard's letter to the Emperor on 24 March 1554, in which he mentioned that "I am sending to your Majesty a dozen little rings blessed this day by the Queen and said to be good for the cramp. It seems that no Queen of England has ever blessed rings before now." Another was in April 1556, reported by John Masone to Sir William Petre on 25 and

¹⁰⁵ Marc Bloch, *The Royal Touch: Monarchy and Miracles in France and England*, trans., J. E. Anderson (New York: Dorset Press, 1961), 105.

26 April 1555.¹⁰⁶ The later one, in particular, was recorded in detail by a Venetian, Marco Antonio Faitta. On Holy Thursday (3 April 1556), she executed the ceremony of the feet-washing for forty one poor women (the same number as the Queen's age) in accordance with old customs. That ceremony ended with the Queen's dispensing of alms. Then, the next day, on Good Friday, the Queen gave her benediction to the cramp rings which were believed to hold healing power for the epileptic and muscular pain. Subsequently, Queen Mary went to perform the touch for scrofula (the king's evil), "but she chose to perform this act privately in a gallery."¹⁰⁷

Faitta paid impressive attention to the Queen's spirit and appearance in those ceremonies. According to Faitta, she executed the ceremonies with an appearance of adamant devotion and piety:

her Majesty struck me as affording a great and rare example of goodness, performing all those acts with such humility and love of religion, offering up her prayers to God with so great devotion and affection, and enduring for so long a while and so patiently so much fatigue; and seeing thus, that the more her Majesty advances in the rule of this kingdom, so does she daily afford fresh and greater opportunities for commending her extreme piety, I dare assert that there never was a queen in Christendom of greater goodness than this one.¹⁰⁸

Faitta's adoration of Queen Mary demonstrates her character as a pious woman as well as a godly ruler. In actual fact, the royal touch had been used for a long time by English kings to demonstrate their magical power and, therefore, propaganda for

¹⁰⁶ *CSP Sp.*, XII, 370; *CSP For.*, 164.

¹⁰⁷ Marco Antonio Faitta to Ippolito Chizzola Doctor in Divinity, 3 May 1556, *CSP Ven.*, VI, part I, 434-35, 436.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 437.

their divinely ordained political power. Hence, Mary's decision to perform the magic royal touch privately in a gallery suggests her desire to style the ceremonies less politically than would a public demonstration of royal magnificence.

Another representation of Mary's virtue of piety was to associate her with the allegorical female personification, *Veritas* (Truth), which stemmed from the well-known classical epigram *Veritas Temporis Filia* ("Truth is the Daughter of Time"), referring to Father Time as the revealer of Truth that has remained hidden. This allegory became useful to the defence of both reformed church and Catholic church in the mid-Tudor period as "Truth" manifested the true religion and was usually represented as a female personage holding the Bible, the words of God. As in the entry of Mary and Philip into London in 1554, Truth, "wyth a boke in her hande, whereon was written *Verbum Dei*," joined other sister personifications, Justicia, Equitas, Misericordia and Sapientia to glorify the King and Queen.¹⁰⁹ Mary herself also adopted the phrase *Veritas Temporis Filia* as her motto which was exhibited in a engraved portrait of the "stern-looking queen" (Figure 5).¹¹⁰ She exploited this allegory to effect the significance that she herself and Catholic tradition were rescued by "Time" from oppression, demonstrating the final triumph of Catholicism.

More profound glorification of Mary's religious virtues was expressed by her Catholic apologists. However, the connection between Mary's virtue of piety and religious restoration has not been seriously examined by modern scholars, much less

¹⁰⁹ Elder, *The Copie of a Letter*, 150-51.

¹¹⁰ King, *Tudor Royal Iconography*, 191-95, esp. 192.

the relationship between the idea of Catholic writers of “mirror-for-princesses,” which were dedicated to the Queen, and Mary’s own practice of self-fashioning. Catholic writers, such as John Proctor, a historian and ardent Roman Catholic, John Christopherson, the Queen’s chaplain, Miles Hoggarde, a poet and opponent of the Reformation, James Cancellor, the Queen’s chaplain, and Thomas Martin, chancellor to the Bishop of Winchester, certainly viewed the Queen as the pivot of the whole promotion of English Catholicism, just as Protestants would later look at Queen Elizabeth I. In order to uphold religious restoration, these writers sought to advance the Queen’s virtuous and godly image concurrently with the triumph of the Church. By the same reasoning, any rebellion against the “most vertuous Quene Mary” were viewed as the similitude against “oure mother the catholike churche,” as James Cancellor maintains in his *The Path of Obedience*.¹¹¹

Mary’s divine qualities were, for those Catholic writers, somehow identical with the sanctity of the Church. They actually attempted to reinforce religious unity with the Roman Church by the demonstration of Queen Mary’s respectable qualities. They therefore praised the Queen’s virtues highly along with her policy in returning English allegiance to Rome. Miles Hoggarde, in his *The Displaying of the Protestantes*, zealously extols the “vertuous and godlye” Queen that her restitution of the “ancient and true religion” had abolished away all kinds of wickedness and abnormality caused by the fall of religious unity.¹¹² Another of Queen Mary’s

¹¹¹ James Cancellor, *The Path of Obedience* (London: J. Waylande, 1556?, STC 4564), sig. B1r.

¹¹² Miles Hoggarde, *The Displaying of the Protestantes, a[nd] sondry their practises, with a discription of diuers their abuses of late frequented* (London: R. Caly, 1556, STC 13557), sig. L2v, 4r, 8r.

supporters, John Proctor, also hails her virtues and achievements in his *The Waie Home to Christ* that

. . . vnder Mary a lady of heauenly simplicitie, y^e liuely sparke of godly loue may eftsones kindle that extinct: the bright sterre of Euangelike lighte may shine, that was obscured: the righte vaine of heauenlye doctrine may appere, that was stopped vp.

Proctor further stresses that through the miraculous and merciful reign of Mary, “many good olde orders newly restored, and so many now erronious nouelties antiquated and made olde.”¹¹³

Mary’s virtues of virginity and piety were most frequently emphasised by Catholic writers. Thomas Martin in his treatise in opposition to the marriage of priests identifies the Queen as a pure virgin.¹¹⁴ Christopherson in his tract against rebellion terms the Queen the “handemayde of God,” the most faithful and humble servant of God and a godly virgin.¹¹⁵ He furthermore portrays the Queen’s deep devotion to God and her trust in God’s defence against enemies, declaring that the Queen

who while the field was in fyghtynge, was feruentlye occupied in prayinge. And when as tidings was brought her, that by treason all was loste, she like a valiaunt Champion of Christ nothyng abashed therewith, sayd that she doubted not at al, but her captayne (meanyng thereby oure Sauour Christe) woulde haue the victory at lengthe, and falling to her prayers agayne.

¹¹³ John Proctor, *The Waie Home to Christ and Truth written by Vincent of Lerins* (London: R. Caly, 1554, STC 24754), sig. A3v, A4r.

¹¹⁴ Thomas Martin, *A Traictise Declaryng and Plainly Prouyng, that the pretended marriage of priestes, and professed persones is no mariage . . .* (London: R. Caly, 1554, STC 17517), sig. A4r-v.

¹¹⁵ John Christopherson, *An Exhortation to All Menne to Take Hede of Rebellion* (London: J. Cawood, 1554, STC 5207), sig. Q4r.

Similarly, Christopherson harps on the Queen's virtue of piety by her persistent reliance on praying,

. . . she neuer goeth aboute any weyghty matter, or attempteh any great enterprise, but firt entreth she into her pryuye closet, and there vpon her knees prayeth god most hartelye, that the wyl of his goodness assiste her in that she entendeth, and so bring her purpose to passe, that the same may be to his glory and the wlethe of all her subiectes.¹¹⁶

Accordingly, those Catholic apologists brought to Queen Mary an image of the Virgin Mary—the virgin, the mother and the spouse of Christ. The Virgin Mary in Catholic teaching had been regarded as the mother of all the members of the Christian world, while the Church was similarly termed as “mother of the catholic church.” Another correlation between the Church and the Virgin Mary was that the Church was usually represented by the figure of the Virgin Mary and also compared to the spouse of Christ.¹¹⁷ The “Queen Mary—Virgin Mary—Church” analogy ultimately constituted the formula of the Catholics' eulogy of Mary's maternity which was employed simultaneously for the advancement of Catholicism.

The two notable works in praise of Mary's maternity were John Christopherson's *An Exhortation* and John Proctor's *The Waie Home to Christ*. Both of these two works contend that the only way leading to truth and salvation is the Catholic Church, “the true spousesse of Christ, our most louing mother.”¹¹⁸ The maternal love of the Church is particularly singled out that this mother's “two brestes are the ii testaments of God, wherfore to know her, is to knowe Christ and truth.”

¹¹⁶ Ibid., sig. O2v. O3v.

¹¹⁷ Warner, *Alone of All Her Sex*, 225, 105-06.

¹¹⁸ Christopherson, *An Exhortation*, sig. K3v; Proctor, *The Waie Home*, sig. A3v.

The writers therefore persuade people to “come home, come home, . . . to your louing and tender mothers lap,”

come home to this swete nourse, that you maye sucke from her brestes the
holsome goode of your soules healthe, and comforte: and leaue the stinkinge
carren wherewith this whore feedeth you.

That statement aims to induces people to leave the arms of Protestantism, the “cruel stepmother,” and to bring them coming back to the united family of the Catholic Church.¹¹⁹ The writers then attempt to produce a similitude between Queen Mary and the Church/tender mother. John Proctor points out that God had elected this noble and godly Queen to call people home: “the faithful and heauenlie virgin crieth earnestlye unto you, O my louinge subiectes of Englande, O dere beloued people, arise arise, come a[nd] accompany the spousesse of Christ. . . .” Portraying Mary as an anxious mother calling her children home, Proctor states that “this mother, Mary the mother of her country calleth you, . . . If you be not at home with this mother, there can be no health in you, but all diseases; there can be no knowledge in you, but al ignoraunce; there can be no hoope of lyfe lefte in you, but assurednes of deathe.”¹²⁰

Likewise, Christopherson identifies Queen Mary as a natural mother of the English people. He stresses the Queen’s maternal love toward all her subjects, stating that she “loueth euerye one of vs as her owne life; who most carefully trauayleth to enriche vs, a[nd] set vs as quiete, who desiret to liue onlye for oure

¹¹⁹ Proctor, *The Waie Home*, sig. A5r, A9r.

¹²⁰ Ibid., sig. C7r, A9v.

welth and commoditie, for to dye were muche more acceptalbe to her, (as she saith oftehtimes) then to lyue in this misrable and wretched world.” Consequently, Christopherson argues that anyone who rises against the Queen is as condemnable as one’s killing his natural mother, and even more unforgivable, for Mary is “y^e mother of a whole realme.”¹²¹ His praise for her maternity subsequently turns to praise her as a godly ruler. He indicates that the Queen follows God’s requirement to advance the glory of God, and to feed, to nourish, to love her people, and to diligently promote her subjects’ good, like a mother to her children. Christopherson highlights the Queen’s self-sacrifice and great industriousness, stating that “she breaketh many a slepe, that we may slepe quietlie; she taketh much care a[nd] anguishe to auoyde vs from care. She tosseth and turmoyleth her selfe, to set vs at ease. She taketh no pleasure in thys lyfe, but only for our comoditie.”¹²²

Christopherson thus implies that Mary’s maternal love and her resolute faith in God are the inducement for her to execute her rule efficiently:

she gyveth also most straight charge to al her officers to execute iustice. She monisheth all them that be in auctoritie, to be ware of briberye, a[nd] taking of reward. And she exhorteth all the clargie of the Realme to be diligent in doynge their duties. She moueth the nobilitie, y^e they be gentle vnto vs, a[nd] that they by no means go aboute to hurte vs.¹²³

By this means—through a convoluted argument—Christopherson skilfully locates Mary’s maternity at the foundation of her fitness to rule, and her inflexible faith in God as the impermeable shield of her government. This transformation subtly

¹²¹ Christopherson, *An Exhortation*, sig. O5v, O6v-7r.

¹²² Ibid., sig. P6v-7r.

¹²³ Ibid., sig. P6r-v.

enhanced the righteousness of Mary's rule and fostered the intractable duty of people's obedience to this godly Queen. Christopherson's strategy is very similar to that of the defenders of those French queen mothers as mentioned in the previous section, though in a more symbolic way—a mother of all the English people.

Mary's image of a pious and virtuous queen was greatly refined by those Catholic writers. She turned to the model of the virtues of charity, chastity, humbleness and godliness, similar to the image of the Virgin Mary who was the embodiment of all Christian virtues. The analogy with maternity and the Catholic church also greatly enlarged the scope of Mary's cultivation of womanly virtues to carry broader connotations of religion and politics. Following the line of those writers' reasoning, Mary could have justified her religious, political and even matrimonial policies by the divine institution of maternal love which guaranteed that all her policies would result from serious consideration of her people's interest and survival. She could also have further legitimated her regal power through the virtues which qualified her as another Virgin Mary, who rules with her son. However, this analogy with maternity, though beneficial to female rule, had no chance to be continually developed after 1554-5, nor was it able to influence the Queen's self-representation significantly after her failure to deliver a child. It was very likely that, after 1555, Queen Mary concentrated too much on the marital relationship and King Philip's position in England to fashion herself in a more public and powerful appearance. Eventually, not only was her private and literal

motherhood frustrated, but also the opportunity of her public and symbolic maternity was abandoned.

In conclusion, Queen Mary's cultivation of queenly virtues was only half achieved. She was certainly right to build a socially acceptable image of a traditional virtuous woman, chaste and modest, instead of an anomalous personage, to reinforce people's acceptance of her womanhood. She was also successful, simultaneously, in elevating herself above other women and constructing herself as a type of the Virgin Mary. Her similitude to the Virgin Queen's virginity and godliness could bring divinity to her status. However, what she really achieved was no more than a traditional queen consort who was conventionally viewed to complement "a king's masculine qualities with perceived feminine virtues of mercy and peacemaking."¹²⁴ In other words, Mary did not have herself demonstrate any virtues which could effectively affirm her rulership as a female monarch and further reinforce people's confidence of her government.

It is not really fair to blame Mary's failure upon her marriage with King Philip; a married ruling queen could rule as successfully as Isabella of Castile. Mary's failure, first, was that she was not aware of the significance of the Catholic writers' suggestion to extend her feminine qualities (like motherhood) to a more popular dimension (to be mother of the land). She was therefore unable to reap political benefits from her efforts in cultivating womanly virtues. Furthermore, Mary's

¹²⁴ Chamberlayne, "Crowns and Virgins," 51.

concentration on the cultivation of womanly virtues, contrary to the ideal queenly virtues which presumed a combination of a feminine image and masculine qualities, proved to be inadequate, or detrimental, to a female ruler. Those points concerning Mary's cultivation of queenly virtues would be an important lesson for the next English queen regnant, Elizabeth I.



Figure 1. Albrecht Dürer, *The Virgin on the Crescent*.



Figure 2. *Mary I*, the first Plea Roll portrait of Mary for Michaelmas, 1553.



Figure 3. *Philip and Mary enthroned, beneath a canopy with windows above,*

Illuminated Plea Roll initial, Michaelmas, 1554.



Figure 4. *Great Seal of Philip and Mary.*



Figure 5. Frans Huys, *Portrait of Mary Tudor*, c. 1554, with her motto “Veritas Temporis Filia.” under the portrait.

Chapter 2

Queen Elizabeth: the Representation of Princely Virtues

Elizabeth Tudor, similar to Mary Tudor, succeeded to the throne amid political and religious divisions and popular distrust of female rule. Developing a virtuous and powerful image for Elizabeth, likewise, became a crucial task throughout her reign. Compared with Mary, Elizabeth's fashioning involved sophisticated fictions, theatricality and the mystification of power.¹ Indeed, Italian culture and its concern with fashioning had a greater impact on England during the reign of Elizabeth than in previous reigns. This was shown by the translation and printing of two important Italian court manuals: Niccolò Machiavelli's *Il Principe*, translated by Peter Whitethorne in 1563 as part of *Arte of Warre* and dedicated to Queen Elizabeth; and Baldesar Castiglione's *Libro del cortegiano*, translated by Thomas Hoby in 1561 as *The Book of the Courtier*.² These two works were the most remarkable products of the Italian culture of dissimulation and they were also two "mirror-for-princes" which advised the prince to cultivate princely virtues of justice, prudence, fortitude and temperance with an expression of political secularism and pragmatism.

¹ Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning from More to Shakespeare* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), 167.

² Its Latin translation (London, 1571) was dedicated to Elizabeth. See Peter Burke, *The Fortunes of the Courtier: the European Reception Castiglione's Cortegiano* (Cambridge: Polity, 1995), 149.

Actually, Englishmen had been reading these two works long before Whitethorne's and Hoby's translations were published. Castiglione's work achieved great success in England and its recommendation of certain codes of behaviour—discretion, decorum, nonchalance and gracefulness—to Italian courtiers become the accepted standard for English gentlemen. It also influenced the writings of Thomas Elyot's *The Book Named the Governor* (1531) and Roger Ascham's *The Schoolmaster* (1570).³ Machiavelli's work, however, brought extensive criticism and suspicion in England, probably because it gave a harsh and open portrayal of the ugly facts of life, engaging the author in an assault upon traditional values and pieties in the name of political realism. Many English scholars therefore associated Machiavelli's *Il Principe* with paganism, opportunism and popery. Even so, Machiavelli's realism was appreciated by Richard Morison and William Thomas, the tutor of Edward VI, and there was a multiplicity of editions and translations of Machiavelli's work in the reign of Elizabeth.⁴

It seems more than likely that Elizabeth was familiar with the works of Castiglione and Machiavelli and their suggestion of princely virtues and self-fashioning, since she learned Italian as a girl. Elizabeth could also have learned of Castiglione's work from her tutor, Roger Ascham, an admirer of his. Moreover, Castiglione's stress on the art of rhetoric as the central intellectual and linguistic tool in creating one's virtuous image was also spectacularly fulfilled by Elizabeth herself

³ For more about Castiglione's influence in England, see Burke, *The Fortunes of the Courtier*.

⁴ Felix Raab, *The English Face of Machiavelli: a Changing Interpretation 1500-1700* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1964), 30-34.

as this chapter will demonstrate. As for Machiavelli's work, not only was Whitethorne's translation dedicated to Elizabeth, but some of her speeches and behaviour were also close to Machiavelli's teaching. For instance, one piece of advice which seldom appeared in the Northern humanist texts of "mirror-for-princes" but was stressed by Machiavelli was the importance of people's goodwill. In two chapters, Machiavelli stressed the importance of the people's support for a prince to rule a country, regardless of his military might; he maintained that "a prince can never make himself safe against a hostile people: there are too many of them. He can make himself safe against the nobles, who are few."⁵ Correspondingly, throughout her reign Elizabeth was very conscious of popular opinion, and simultaneously, attempted to justify her rule as the will of the people, ardently expressing her gratitude for their love (I will discuss this further in Chapters 4 and 6). In short, Elizabeth must have exposed herself to the Italian culture of fashioning to a greater extent than Mary and was more familiar with its craft.

However, there were great contradictions between the Italian craft of dissimulation and political pragmatism on the one hand and Elizabeth's humanist upbringing on the other. Elizabeth was instructed with the support of her stepmother, Katherine Parr, and a group of reform-minded scholars. They formed a predominant atmosphere of Christian humanism or Erasmianism, which emphasised the blend of piety and learning with little attention to political realism.⁶ Princess

⁵ Niccolò Machiavelli, *The Prince*, trans. George Bull (Penguin Books, 1961) 6, 31.

⁶ See William P. Haugarrrd, "Katherine Parr: the Religious Convictions of a Renaissance Queen," *Renaissance Quarterly* 22 (1969): 346-59.

Elizabeth, influenced by Katherine, had developed a definite religious interest in her early life and even translated Margaret of Navarre's devotional poem, *Le Miroir de L'âme Pécheresse* at the end of 1554 as a New Year's gift for Queen Katherine.⁷ In her humanist curriculum, Roger Ascham also paid great heed to her religious learning; he sought to develop her mind and character by combining the finest classical works and the teaching of Christian faith. The Princess's daily courses began with a passage from the Greek New Testament, supplemented by patristic works, such as Saint Cyprian's work and Melanchthon's *Loci Communes*; in the afternoon, she practised the "double translation" of classical works of Isocrates and Demosthenes.⁸ The purpose of this humanist educational programme for Elizabeth was to form a deep Christian faith, a religious sincerity, rather than use piety as propaganda to win honour, which Machiavelli advocated through his praising of Ferdinand of Aragon who won great honour under the cloak of religion.⁹

⁷ John Bale published Elizabeth's translation in 1548 at Wesel, shortly before his return from his first period of exile, as *A godly medytacyon of the Christen sowle concerninge a love towardes God and hys christe, compiled in Frenche by Lady Margaret queene of navere and aptely translated into Englysh by the ryght vertuous lady Elyzabeth doughter to Kynge Henri the viii* (STC, 17320). Patrick Collinson argues that this translation opens a wider window for historians about Elizabeth's religiosity in his *Elizabethan Essays* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1994), 93. More about Elizabeth's *Miroir*, see Anne Lake Prescott, "The Pearl of the Valois and Elizabeth I: Marguerite de Navarre's *Miroir* and Tudor England," in *Silent But for the Words: Tudor Women as Patrons, Translators and Writers of Religious Works*, ed. Margaret P. Hannay (Kent, Ohio.: Kent State University Press, 1985), 61-91.

⁸ Roger Ascham, *The Schoolmaster*, ed. Lawrence V. Ryan (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, published for the Folger Shakespeare Library, 1967), 56-87. Also see J. E. Neale, *Queen Elizabeth* (London: Janathan Cape, 1938), 25.

⁹ See Machiavelli's *The Prince*, chapter 21. Peter Burke points out that "religion was virtually bound to take on a particularly theatrical quality," but Northern Europe had higher sense of sincerity than the south. See his *The Historical Anthropology of Early Modern Italy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 12, 13.

Christian humanists also applied a sense of sincerity in their approach to self-fashioning. Their instruction on decent manners and polite behaviour was meant to reflect inner beauty and virtues and true qualities, as Erasmus's *De civilitate morum pueriliu* (1530) stressed. Nevertheless, the Italian culture of fashioning was particularly an art of feigning and disguising. Although Castiglione declared that "external appearances often bear witness to what is within," and "habits, and manners, as well as actions and words, provide clues to the qualities of the man," he accentuated more outward forms of polite and prudent behaviour.¹⁰ As he suggested, a courtier "must praise the achievements of others with great kindness and goodwill; and although he may think himself a man to be admired and by a long chalk superior to everyone else, he should not reveal this." This demonstrates a clear tone of artificiality and insincerity.¹¹ Machiavelli took this insincerity even further, maintaining that "everyone sees what you appear to be, few experience what you really are."¹² He never thought the inner virtues to be necessary to create the correct impression, and sometimes a prince even needed to act on the contrary, "in defiance of good faith, of charity, of kindness, of religion," in order to win good reputation and maintain his state.¹³

Another contradiction between the teaching of Italian "mirror-for-princes" and that of Elizabeth's education was related to gender roles. Although Ascham was

¹⁰ Baldesar Castiglione, *The Book of the Courtier*, trans. George Bull (Penguin Books, 1976), 135, 136.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 147.

¹² Machiavelli, *The Prince*, 56.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 55, 56.

more liberal than Vives, Mary's tutor, with regard to women's education, and held a higher opinion of women's capacity for learning, developing Elizabeth's character as a ruler was not the aim of his instruction. Instead, he followed the first generation of English humanists to inculcate Elizabeth with the feminine virtues of chastity, modesty and obedience. However, Castiglione's and Machiavelli's books primarily addressed gentlemen and princes and were intended to assist a prince to cultivate masculine virtues. How did Elizabeth, being both a woman and a ruler, absorb the contradictory teachings she learned from her early education and the Italian "mirror-for-princes"? Would she stick to the doctrines she had learned during her early life and concentrate on the cultivation of womanly virtues as had her half-sister? Or would she be able to cultivate perfect queenly virtues, combining both feminine and masculine qualities, and to blend sincerity and dissimulation in her art of self-fashioning? This chapter proposes to answer those questions and explores Elizabeth's cultivation of virtue in her own voice, against the background of Elizabeth's education and the Italian culture of self-fashioning.

There has not been much attention paid in modern scholarship to Elizabeth's own ideas on her self-fashioning, except by some American female historians, such as Allison Heish, Ilona Bell and Lena Cowen Orlin.¹⁴ Most modern research, corresponding to the fact that Elizabeth's reign produced a tremendous amount of eulogies on the Queen's virtue in a variety of forms, including plays, paintings,

¹⁴ Allison Heish, "Queen Elizabeth I: Parliamentary Rhetoric and the Exercise of Power," *Sign* 1-1 (1975): 31-55; Ilona Bell, "Elizabeth I—Always Her Own Free Woman," Lena Cowen Orlin, "The Fictional Families of Elizabeth I," both in *Political, Rhetoric Power, and Renaissance Women*, eds. Carole Levin and Patricia A. Sullivan (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995).

poetry and pageantry, focuses on representations of Elizabeth by her panegyrists. An overview of existing research and contemporary glorification of the Queen is therefore necessary to locate the importance of the Queen's own voice and to bring a new dimension to the understanding of Elizabeth's cultivation of queenly virtues. The first section of this chapter discusses representations of Elizabeth by her subjects and the problems in modern research, in order to usher in the new focus for this chapter. The second section views Elizabeth's development of female virtues and argues that her peculiar strategy of fashioning can be better understood through a comparison with Mary. The third section concentrates on Elizabeth's cultivation of princely virtues in order for us to measure the influence of her humanist education and her familiarity with Italian "mirror-for-princes." The final section examines the extent that Elizabeth's Protestant supporters corresponded the Queen's self-representation, and the way that they demonstrated her princely virtues further to promote a national allegiance to her religious settlement and political authority.

I. The representations of Elizabeth's virtues

English people's concern over the new Queen's virtue appeared as early as Elizabeth's first procession in 1559.¹⁵ In its second pageant, a device of "the seate of gouvernement" was set at the lower end of Cornhill. There, a child representing the Queen was placed on the seat which was "supported by certaine vertues, which

¹⁵ See Chapter 4, section II, for further details.

suppressed other vices vnder their seate.” These virtues—“Pure religion,” “loue of subiectes,” “Wisedome,” “Iustice”—were represented by four lively personages who were trampling upon four corresponding vices— “Superstition and Ignoraunce,” “Rebellion and Insolencie,” “follie and vaine glorie,” “Adulacion and Briberie.”¹⁶ This pageant expressed the City’s exhortation to the Queen that “the right office of a Prince was, and is to aduaunce vertue and suppressse vice.”¹⁷ It continued a medieval tradition in its exhortation of the ruler to cultivate certain virtues at the royal entry; moreover, it conveyed the message of Renaissance humanists’ ideal rule, which grounded political success in the ruler’s virtue. As the official text of this entry, *The Quenes Maiesties Passage*, declared:

the grounde of this pageant, was that like as by vertues (which doe abundantly appere in her grace) the Queenes maiestie was established in the seate of gouernement: so she should syt fast in the same so long as she embraced vertue and helde vice under foote. For if vice once goote vp the head, it woulde put the seate of gouernement in perill of falling.¹⁸

The virtues articulated by the City demonstrated the people’s expectations of a different age signified by Elizabeth’s accession. Mary’s rule was symbolically represented by Superstition, Ignorance, Rebellion, Insolence, Folly, Adulation and Bribery, calling upon the people’s memory of turbulent Catholicism, conspiracies, insurrections and foreign marriage. As the fourth pageant demonstrated, they fervently hoped the new Queen would bring the green and beautiful *Respublica bene*

¹⁶ *The Quenes Maiesties Passage through the Citie of London to Westminster the Day before her Coronation*, ed. James M. Osborn (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960), sig. B3r, B3v.

¹⁷ Richard Grafton, *Abridgement of the Chronicles of England* (London, 1572), f.195r.

¹⁸ *The Quenes Maiesties Passage*, sig. B4v.

instituta (flourishing commonwealth) to displace the barren and stony *Ruinosa Respublica* (decayed commonwealth). Indeed, future prosperity was perceived to be dependent on the Queen's cultivation of virtues.

The discourse of pageantry also included two devices to eulogise Elizabeth's virtues. She was linked to "Truth," *Veritas Temporis Filia* (the daughter of Time), and Deborah, the female judge in the old Testament, so as to advocate Elizabeth's virtues of true piety and good government. *Veritas Temporis Filia* was the motto of Queen Mary, as mentioned in the previous chapter, and was used to display a powerful image of a religious restorer. Rehabilitating the old symbol of "Truth" for appropriation by a new Protestant queen, Elizabeth's first procession of 1559 made a theatrical representation of it. This fictional scene was set at the Little Conduit in Cheapside where two "hylls or mountaynes of conuenient heyghte" symbolised two types of regimes: one "cragged, barreyn and stonye," and the other "fayre, freshe, grene, and beawtifull."¹⁹ Then, a personage appeared from an artificial cave between these two hills representing *Tyme*, leading another personage, *Veritas*, the daughter of Time, who "helde a booke in her hande vpon the which was written, *Verbum veritatis*, the woorde of trueth"—an English Bible.²⁰ The book was then delivered to the Queen by Sir John Parrat, "as soon as she had receiued the booke, kyssed it, and with both her handes held vp the same, and so laid it vpon her brest, with great thanks to the citie."²¹ Elizabeth herself indeed actively and consciously

¹⁹ Ibid. sig. C3v-4r.

²⁰ Ibid., sig. C4r-v.

²¹ Ibid., sig. Cv.

involved herself in this pageant and effectively represented herself as Truth, kissing and embracing the Bible, to emphasise the new significance of this allegory as a promotion of Protestantism.

In fact, *Veritas Temporis Filia* was only one of many similarities between Elizabeth's representations and those of Mary, and many aspects of "the cult of Elizabeth" owed their origin to her sister's reign: both of the two queens were extolled as the Virgin Mary, legendary goddesses such as the moon-goddess Diana, and remarkable biblical heroines like Judith. In addition, many other conventions of Queen Mary's panegyrics survived through Elizabeth's reign, though they underwent significant transposition and disguise. The continuation and reconstruction of Queen Mary's representations in the reign of Elizabeth demonstrated that allusions used to glorify female rulers could cross over the boundary of religions, following the long tradition in Europe of praising extraordinary women.²² It also reveals that Elizabethans did reuse the skill of Mary's representations and we should not be blinded by the myth of Elizabeth's uniqueness.

The associations of the Queen with female personae in Elizabeth's coronation procession marked the start of subsequent multiple comparisons of Elizabeth to

²² Intriguingly, even attack on both queen, made both by Protestants and Catholics, utilised the same analogy of Jezebel. Some Protestants vilified Queen Mary as a new Jezebel as Chapter 1, section II, has shown. Likewise, Elizabeth was compared to Jezebel by those Catholics who supported Mary, Queen of Scots. In a series of poems on the death of Mary, such as Adam Blackwood's *A Poem Concerning the Parricides of the Jezebel of England* (1588), Elizabeth was represented as "the Jezebel of England," contrasting with the Scottish Queen's martyrdom. More see James Emerson Phillips, *Images of a Queen: Mary Stuart in Sixteenth Century Literature* (Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1964), 129, 162-69, 194-96, 222. This fact manifested that the libellers of the female rulers also shared the same means of representations through female personae to subvert queens' authority, which crossed over the boundary of Catholicism and Protestantism too.

legendary women and goddesses. Elizabeth's first apologist, John Aylmer, provided a normative model for later apologists in 1559 in his *An Harborowe for Faithfull and Trewe Subiectes* (1559).²³ He mirrored the new Queen in three heroines, Deborah, Esther and Judith—models of active female rule in Scripture. These female biblical figures were all famous for their power and piety. Deborah, the rescuer of the Israelite chosen people from Canaanite idolatry, was readily identified with Elizabeth to illustrate her attempts to uproot popery and build up the Protestant church in England. Judith in her victory over Holofernes could serve as an allegory for Elizabeth indicating that her true faith would defeat God's foes. Esther, a royal consort rather than a queen regnant, had used her influence and mediatory powers with her husband to sabotage his chief ministers' treacherous conspiracy against her own people, was perfect to identify Elizabeth as the mediator between her people and God. Deborah, Judith, and Esther continued to be identified with Elizabeth in her reign, especially before the 1580s, in pageantry, woodcuts and other visual representations.²⁴

As her reign lengthened, Elizabeth's symbolic representation expanded to embrace the classical as well as the biblical. As the characters of Thomas Dekker's *Old Fortunatus* declared in 1596,

1. Are you then traueelling to the temple of *Eliza*?
2. Euen to her temple are my feeble limbs traueelling. Some call her *Pandora*; some *Gloriana*, some *Cynthia*: some *Belphoebe*, some *Astraea*: all

²³ John N. King, *Tudor Royal Iconography: Literature and Art in an Age of Religious Crisis* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989), 226.

²⁴ John N. King, "The Godly Woman in Elizabethan Iconography," *Renaissance Quarterly* 38 (1985): 41-84.

by seuerall names to expresse seuerall loues: Yet all those names make but one celestial body, as all those loues meete to create but one soule.

1. I am one of her owne countrie, and we adore her by the name of *Eliza*.²⁵

In addition to these names, Elizabeth was associated with many other female personae in her reign, including Laura, the vestal virgin, Diana, Ceres (mother goddess of corn and plenty), the bride of the Song of Songs, the Woman Clothed with the Sun, and the Virgin Mary, and a few feminine objects, such as the rose, the lily, the moon, and the pearl (all of which had been associated with the Virgin). Elizabeth was also linked with masculine or androgynous objects, such as the sun and the Phoenix. Yet in accordance with her own sex, she was most commonly compared to female figures, who embodied the Queen's feminine virtues primarily, such as beauty and chastity.

Indeed, amongst Elizabeth's virtues, the virtue of virginity was celebrated by Elizabethan panegyrists with the utmost fervour. However, the multiple panegyric of the Queen's virginity not only purported to present its face value as the core of a queen's womanly virtues, but also extended this specific quality to symbolise the Queen's sanctity, in both political and religious terms. As in George Peele's *Descensus Astraeae* (1591) and Sir John Davies's *Hymnes to Astraea* (1599), they represented the Queen as Virgo-Astraea, associating the Queen with the Golden Age of imperial rule.²⁶ In Edward Hellwis's *A Marvell Deciphered* (1589) and Oxford

²⁵ Thomas Dekker, *Old Fortunatus*, in *The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker*, I, ed. Fredson Bowers (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953), 113.

²⁶ Frances A. Yates, "Queen Elizabeth as Astraea," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 10 (1947): 27-82; also printed in her *Astraea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century* (London: Pimlico, 1975), 29.

University's funeral verses (1603), the Queen was represented as the Virgin Mary. This became Elizabeth's major icon in and after the 1580s and configured her as the virgin queen, the mother and the nurse of the nation. Moreover, George Chapman's *The Shadow of Night* (1594) and Walter Raleigh's *Ocean's love to Cynthia* (1592?) presented the Queen as the moon or moon-goddesses, to emphasise Elizabeth's virtue of chastity, and also to manifest her personal immortality and the sacredness and constancy of her rule. Similarly, Edmund Spenser's *The Faerie Queene* (1590) mirrored Elizabeth as Gloriana/Belpheobe to present all Elizabeth's private and public virtues, and to justify the legitimacy of her female rule as a Virgin-Ruler.²⁷ Additionally, the portraiture, *Queen Elizabeth and the Three Goddesses* (1569) compared Elizabeth with classical goddesses; it depicted a revised version of the Judgement of Paris in which Pallas, Juno and Venus resigned the contended prize of the golden apple to Elizabeth because she combined and surpassed all their allegorical virtues of chastity, majesty and beauty, respectively, in one person.

The plurality of representations of Elizabeth's virginity was indeed not only a symbol of her female perfection, but also the embodiment of the righteousness and justice of her government and the purity of the reformed Church.²⁸ Moreover, the connotation carried a sense of nationhood, in its celebration of the independence of England from foreign disturbance and contamination; as Helen Hackett suggests, "Elizabeth's bodily intactness can be used to figure the inviolability of the English

²⁷ Susanne Woods, "Spenser and the Problem of Women's Rule," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 48-2 (1985): 141-58.

²⁸ Frances A. Yates, "The Triumph of Chastity," in Frances A. Yates, *Astraea*, 114.

nation state.”²⁹ Furthermore, Elizabeth’s virginity also manifested a divine miracle, God’s special favour to England, as John Lyly declared in his *Euphues and his England* in 1580

. . . what hath this chaste Uirgin *Elizabeth* don who by the space of twenty and odde yeares with continuall peace against all politices, with sundry myracles, contrary to all hope, hath gouerned that noble Island. Against whome neyther forren force, nor ciuill fraude, neyther discorde at home, nor conspiricies abroad, could preuaile. What greater meruaile hath happened since the beginning of the world, then for a young and tender maiden, to gouern strong and valiaunt menne, then for a Uirgin to make the whole worlde, if not to stand in awe of hir, yet to honour hir. . . .³⁰

Lyly’s idealisation and glorification of Elizabeth’s virginal rule was generally shared or fabricated by all Elizabethan panegyrists to stimulate a popular allegiance to the Queen, the nation and the Protestant Church.

The sophistication and proliferation of representations of Elizabeth in various female personae has inspired zealous research on Elizabeth’s representations in modern scholarship. Pioneered by E. C. Wilson’s *England’s Eliza* in 1939, study of the Queen’s representations was succeeded by Yates and Roy Strong, both of whom supplement Wilson’s work with more iconographical sources. The Wilson-Yates-Strong tradition also led to the so-called “cult of Elizabeth,” which has become more popular in recent works in this field. The idea of “the cult of Elizabeth” suggests that there was a cult of the new Protestant Queen to replace the psychic and spiritual

²⁹ Helen Hackett, *Virgin Mother, Maiden Queen: Elizabeth I and the Cult of the Virgin Mary* (London: Macmillan Press, 1995), 127.

³⁰ John Lyly, *Euphues and his England* (1580) in *The Complete Works of John Lyly*, II, ed. R. Warwick Bond (Oxford: Clarendon, 1902), 209.

vacuum left by the Catholic cult of the Virgin Mary.³¹ This formula is cautiously discussed by Wilson, who suggests that Elizabethan panegyrists “unconsciously transferred some of the adoration which by right of strict inheritance was due a far holier virgin.”³² Yates is also hesitant in advocating this theory;

The startling suggestion makes one begin to ask oneself whether the cult of the virgin queen, was, perhaps half-unconsciously, intended to take the place of the cult of the Virgin, one of the most abiding characteristics of the ancient faith.³³

Later scholars, such as Stephen Greenblatt and Lisa Jardine, have however taken this idea for granted, stressing the fact that there was a “unconscious ” or “half-unconscious” transference of Marian symbolism at the centre of Elizabeth’s idealisation.³⁴ Yet since 1990, some scholars have begun to challenge the idea. New interpretations centre on two controversies. The first question is whether the Elizabethan writers’ manipulation of this symbolic transference was conscious or unconscious. The second is the doubt as to whether Elizabeth had taken a perpetual vow of virginity at the beginning of her reign and was therefore able to inspire her panegyrists to highlight the virtue of chastity.

Addressing the first question, Peter McClure and Robin Headlam Wells suggest that Wilson and Yates have not given enough positive affirmation to the idea of “the cult of Elizabeth” as the second Virgin Mary, nor paid sufficient attention to the more

³¹ Roy Strong, *The Cult of Elizabeth: Elizabethan Portraiture and Pageantry* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1977), 16.

³² E. C. Wilson, *England’s Eliza* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1939), 200.

³³ Yates, “Queen Elizabeth I as Astraea,” 78.

³⁴ The examples see Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*, Chapter 4; Lisa Jardine, *Still Harping on Daughters: Women and Drama in the Age of Shakespeare* (Hemel Hempstead: Harvester, 1983).

significant Marian sources relating to Elizabeth's representations. Disagreeing with Wilson's conservative suggestion, they declare that, instead of an unconscious adaptation, Elizabethan panegyrists coherently and comprehensively made use of Marian concepts and iconographic resources to praise Elizabeth.³⁵ From the other viewpoint, Helen Hackett discards any hint of conscious or unconscious substitution for the pre-Reformation cult of the Virgin Mary, which naively "asserts the existence of a spontaneous popular cult of Elizabeth." She argues that the new study should discard the hypothesis that there was a coherent and united people in the reign of Elizabeth; instead, she advocates an understanding of Elizabethan writers' motivations through diverse perspectives in their political and religious context, maintaining that "the glorification of Elizabeth as the Virgin Queen was produced by far more complex and variable processes than just a desire to replace the Virgin Mary."³⁶ For the second question, the research of John King, McClure and Wells imposes chronological sensitivity upon recent conceptions of Elizabeth's image as a virgin, and emphasises that Elizabeth's shift to a perpetual virgin actually happened during the 1570s and was rapidly intensified through Elizabethan panegyric and iconography in the 1580s and the 1590s.³⁷ Helen Hackett's idea of contextualisation and John King's calling for a diachronic review of contemporary evidence have had a significant influence on the present study of Elizabeth's

³⁵ Peter McClure and Robin Headlam Wells, "Elizabeth I as a second Virgin Mary," *Renaissance Studies* 4-1 (1990): 38-70.

³⁶ Hackett, *Virgin Mother, Maiden Queen*, 8, 241.

³⁷ McClure and Wells, "Elizabeth I as a second Virgin Mary," 68; John N. King, "Queen Elizabeth I: Representations of the Virgin Queen," *Renaissance Quarterly* 43 (1990): 30-74.

representations. Currently, scholars are more aware than earlier generations of the following possibilities: first, that every panegyrist may have held different motives according to their social position and the genre of his work; second, that there existed a shift in Elizabethan policy of the Queen's body—a virgin or a marriageable woman—from the early reign to the late years.

Existing study of Elizabeth's representations nevertheless still carries several problems which might undermine our understanding of Elizabeth's cultivation of virtues. First, there is no clear awareness of the differentiation between Elizabeth's own representations and her representations devised by others. Actually, the Queen and her supporters are not necessarily a unanimous entity, nor did all supporters manufacture Elizabeth's images solely according to her interest or self-perception. Occasionally, Elizabeth felt irritated by her subjects' elaborately devised representations of the Queen, where she sensed a sort of rudeness or challenge to her power. For instance, during her summer progress to Robert Dudley's castle of Kenilworth in July 1575, two entertainments centred on promoting Dudley's marriage proposal and her military ambition in the Netherlands were cancelled, because Elizabeth discerned Dudley's pretensions in these two shows when she censored them.³⁸ Indeed, a wider survey of Elizabeth's own speeches may find that the Queen had different techniques and emphases from some of her panegyrists. However, modern research has not paid enough attention to Elizabeth's own voice,

³⁸ See Susan Frye, *Elizabeth I: The Competition for Representation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), Chapter 2.

concentrating instead almost exclusively upon Elizabethan literature and iconography. The result is not only the lack of a comparison between Elizabeth's self-representation and the images represented by her supporters, but also the distortion of our comprehension of the Queen's self-cultivation of virtues.

Second, almost every work concentrates overwhelmingly on Elizabeth's representations through female personae or female objects, and correspondingly on the analogy with her female virtues. Nevertheless, Elizabeth had been associated not just with female figures in the works of her supporters. Several Elizabethan texts accentuated Elizabeth's combination of traditionally masculine and feminine qualities, such as James Aske's *Elizabeth Triumphans* (1588), which celebrated the victory over the Spanish Armada, and Spenser's *The Faerie Queene*, in which Elizabeth was represented as the female warrior Britomart. Moreover, some female personae were utilised not only to illustrate Elizabeth's femininity or her virtue of chastity, but also her heroic virtues of courage, fortitude and martialism, such as the Queen of the Amazons.³⁹ Also, Thomas Cecil's engraving, *Truth Presents the Queene with a Lance* (1625), depicted Elizabeth as an armoured knight, like Spenser's Britomart, receiving a lance and trampling the dragon of Catholicism, which vividly demonstrated Elizabeth's militarism. In addition, Elizabeth also attached to herself the images of male figures, such as God's beloved prophet Daniel when Elizabeth invoked in her prayer at the coronation entry. Indeed, this early

³⁹ See Winfried Schleiner, "Divina virago: Queen Elizabeth as an Amazon," *Studies in Philology*, 75 (1985): 163-80.

analogy demonstrates that the Queen's self-representation was not necessarily the same as the images propagated by her subjects who represented the Queen in the female personae of Deborah and the goddess Truth on the very same occasion. This case also illustrates the fact that Elizabeth's images could be as efficaciously associated with male figures as with female ones, but present scholarship is still prone to underestimate that dimension of Elizabeth's own personal representations.

The third problem, relating to the last one, is that the courtly panegyric (poems, paintings and pageantry and other entertainments) overtly dominate the sources employed by modern scholars. Such panegyrics basically continued the medieval literary form of courtly love, incorporating classical allusions, which were commonly utilised to praise the beauty and virtues of the Virgin Mary and secular mistresses. There were nevertheless other forms of literature that, unlike courtly eulogy, presented a more masculine Protestant queen through the analogy with male figures, specifically John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*, which represented Elizabeth as Solomon and Constantine to symbolise the perfect Christian ruler. In addition, by consulting Protestant sermons for the celebration of the Queen's Accession Day, we can discern a conspicuous preference for representing the Queen's virtues through association with Old Testament kings and prophets, such as King David, Solomon and Joshua, instead of the Virgin Mary. In a sense, John Foxe's work and these sermons were more important than those courtly eulogies, because they aimed to address a broader audience, adding more value of political propaganda.

The theme of this present chapter is to argue that existing research on Elizabeth's representations is not sufficient for our understanding of Elizabeth's cultivation of virtues. It will be demonstrated that more attention should be given to the Queen's own voice to understand her own art of fashioning rule and virtues. In addition, Elizabeth's self-fashioning should not be viewed as an isolated and peculiar case, but needs to be juxtaposed with other cases of Renaissance ruling queens, especially with her sister, Mary Tudor. Therefore, a comparison between these two queen regnants will be made along with a narrative of Elizabeth's development of virtues. Moreover, a new focus on Elizabeth's representations through male figures, looking beyond the analogies with female personae, might therefore lead us towards a more complete interpretation of Elizabeth's cultivation of virtues. Thus this chapter will make use of several sermons, from after the 1570s, preached for the annual celebration of the Queen's Accession Day in order to explore Elizabeth's supporters' use of male images as illustrations of her religious and princely virtues.

II. The fusing of male and female identities

It is important to bear in mind that the underlying purpose of the glorification of the two Tudor queen regnants was to eliminate people's diffidence towards and even defiance of female rule. As John King suggests, "the fundamental issue of late Tudor iconography is the constitutional problem of the capacity of a queen."⁴⁰ To a

⁴⁰ King, *Tudor Royal Iconography*, 212.

great extent, the queens' cultivation of virtues enabled them to prove their capacity to rule, and it was utilised to endorse their regal authority. Yet, before they could make people accept their role as a ruler, they had to satisfy society's expectation of them as a woman, and so to be the model of all feminine virtues, just as a king was expected to be the model of perfect manliness.

No evidence shows that Elizabeth or her government ever radically challenged the traditional construction of the female sex, but it does suggest that she accepted the existing female inferiority in society. Three official homilies of Elizabethan government, that were devised to control women's behaviour, such as specific restrictions on women's apparel and work, were strengthened to reinforce women's subordination to their husbands, in spite of the fact that the country was ruled by a woman. Indeed the homily on marriage still maintained that "the husband ought to be the leader and author of love in cherishing and encreasing . . . for the woman is a weak creature, not endued with like strength and constance of mind," whilst one woman's mind significantly swayed the future of England.⁴¹

Elizabeth herself also valued wifely loyalty highly, as she wrote to Lady Elizabeth Hoby in 1566 to praise her love and well-accomplished duty towards her husband.⁴² More evidence was shown in her letters indicating the dishonour of Mary, Queen of Scots, Elizabeth's cousin and a rival female monarch, in the murder of Mary's second husband, Lord Darnley. The death of Darnley on 9 February 1567

⁴¹ Cited in Carole Levin, "Advice on Women's Behavior in Three Tudor Homilies," *International Journal of Women's Studies*, 6-2 (1983): 176-85.

⁴² Harrison, 48.

gave rise a widespread suspicion that Mary herself might have had a hand in it, furthered by Mary's own unwise behaviour in attending a wedding on the day after the murder, instead of mourning in seclusion.⁴³ This seriously damaged not only her crown, but also her womanly virtue as a wife. Elizabeth accordingly raised up the traditional criteria of wifely duty to advise Mary, even though she was a queen regnant, to "take this matter to heart, that you may show the world what a noble Princess and loyal woman you are."⁴⁴

Elizabeth never advocated those virtues unconventional to women. She denied tellingly that eloquence was a suitable virtue for women, stating that "for my sex will not beare yt," in one of her parliamentary speeches.⁴⁵ This might be her cunning use of rhetoric, for she herself was the ultimate example of a skilful orator, as was Antony in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, despite his insistence that "I am no orator."⁴⁶ Nevertheless, she was very conscious of the disadvantage of her gender, as she reminded her court over the Emperor's breach of promise, saying that "the Emperor has offered me so great an insult that if I were a man instead of a woman, I would defy him to single combat."⁴⁷ In addition, Elizabeth deeply understood society's expectations of a woman, particularly relating to her own problem of marriage as she knew that "there is a strong idea in the world that a woman cannot live unless she is

⁴³ Jenny Wormald, *Mary Queen of Scots: A Study in Failure* (London: Collins & Brown, 1991), 161-62.

⁴⁴ Harrison, 49.

⁴⁵ *Parliaments*, I, 474.

⁴⁶ William Shakespeare, *Julius Caesar*, ed. T. S. Dorsch (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd, the Arden Shakespeare, 1965), III-2, 86.

⁴⁷ Frederick Chamberlin ed., *The Sayings of Queen Elizabeth* (London: John Lane the Bodley Head Ltd., 1923), 295.

married.”⁴⁸ Cultivating the image of a virtuous woman was therefore a crucial destination for her to pursue.

Elizabeth was actually as keen as her sister on the cultivation of womanly virtues to attune her image to society’s perception. This section does not set out to reiterate existing knowledge of the representations of Elizabeth’s womanly virtues. Rather, it will focus on the comparison between Elizabeth’s cultivation of female qualities and that of her sister, Mary. There were surprising similarities between Elizabeth’s representations and those of Mary, as indicated in the previous section. Elizabeth nevertheless distinguished herself from Mary’s self-fashioning of female virtues in two aspects. Firstly, Elizabeth was more aware of extending her femininity to a public level than Mary, and more successful in associating her private female virtues with a powerful image of imperial rule. Secondly, Elizabeth outdid Mary’s cultivation of womanly virtues in her extensive manipulation of sexual ambiguity or doubling of her gender roles.

In the first place, Elizabeth’s cultivation of virginity was a useful case to demonstrate her different strategy from her sister. Elizabeth fashioned herself as a virgin from the beginning of her reign and referred to herself as “God’s hand maide” several times in her speeches and prayer-books as Mary had done. As in Elizabeth’s speech, closing her fourth parliament, the Queen stated that “as for those rare and speciall bennifittes which have manie yeares followed and accompanied my happie raine, I attribute to God aloane the prince of rule, and count my self no better then his

⁴⁸ Guzman De Silva to the King, 24 March 1565, *CSP Spain*, I, 410.

hand maide, rather brought up in a scoole to abide the ferula then traded in a kingdom to supporte the scepter.”⁴⁹ Elizabeth usually employed the term “the handmaid of God” to denote her humble submission to her destiny as God’s instrument to advance true religion and good government. Yet Elizabeth also frequently employed it to refer to her care and love for her people as she associated herself with the image of a self-sacrificed “virgin wax” in her last speech to the Parliament in 1601, stating that “I have diminished my owne revenewe that I might adde to your securitie, and bene content to be a taper of trewe vigin waxe to wast my self and spend my life that I might give light and comfort to those that live under me.”⁵⁰ The imagery of a virgin wax not only illustrated her private virtue of virginity, but also vividly symbolised that her rule would bring light and warmth to her people and the Church.

Another image traditionally used to signify womanly virtues was maternity, which had been used by Queen Mary in her early reign but she was unable to perpetuate the symbol further after her marriage. Not surprisingly, Elizabeth learned from Mary and epitomised herself as a mother to demonstrate further her good rule. For Elizabeth, the maternal metaphor was not only exploited to display her natural dedication to the care of her nation.⁵¹ She also assured her subjects that she was the most loving and careful mother they had ever had; “I assure yow all that though after my death yow may have many stepdames, yet shall yow never have any

⁴⁹ On 15 March 1576, *Parliaments*, I, 472.

⁵⁰ On 19 December 1601, *ibid.*, III, 278.

⁵¹ Hackett indicates that the image of Elizabeth as a mother became commonplace during the 1560s and 70s. Hackett, *Virgin Mother, Maiden Queen*, 77.

a more naturall mother then I meane to be unto you all.”⁵² Moreover, maternity was valuable for Elizabeth to assert her political power, as a mother’s authority, over her children/subjects. The use of the maternal image proved to be efficacious, inciting her subjects also to compare her to the nation’s mother, as shown in one of the petitions from Parliament, stating that “we beseche your Majesty of your princely care and motherly love towards us your servant and children, that we many continue . . . obeying yow like children for duty, reverence and love”⁵³

Furthermore, the image of a wife was a consequential part of both Mary’s and Elizabeth’s cultivation of womanly virtues. Elizabeth presented herself as the wife of all English people, starting from the controversy of her marriage to her later reign.⁵⁴ In her reply to Sir John Harington’s wife who declared that she kept her husband’s affection by demonstrating her steadfastness and obedience to him, Elizabeth stated that “you are wisely bent I find; after such sort do I keep the good will of all my husbands—my good people—for if they did not rest assured of some special love towards them, they would not readily yield me such good obedience.”⁵⁵ Intriguingly, wifedom for Elizabeth was not intended to exhibit her female submission to her husband(s) as Mary had done, but to express her pure and affectionate love towards her people in order to win over their hearts. She thus

⁵² On 28 January 1563, *Parliaments*, I, 95.

⁵³ “Proposed petition of the Commons to the Queen,” 16 November 1566, *ibid.*, I, 157.

⁵⁴ More see Chapter 6, section II.

⁵⁵ John Harington, “Brief Notes and Remembrances,” in *Nugae Antiquae: Being a Miscellaneous Collection of Original Papers in Prose and Verse Written during the Reigns of Henry VIII, Edward VI, Queen Mary, Elizabeth, and King James*, I, ed. Henry Harington (London: Vernor and Hood, 1804), 177-78.

reversed the contemporary doctrine of the conjugal relationship and instead implied a collective subordination of husbands/subjects to the symbolic wife/Queen.

On the whole, all Elizabeth's cultivation of female qualities, as the virgin, wife and mother, was not only meant to build a socially acceptable female model, but was also intended to establish a positive image of the female ruler. To some degree, as Lena Cowen Orlin suggests, Elizabeth consciously manipulated superficial familial tropes to invite her subjects to pay her intimate affection and obedience, although she had no family of her own. Unlike Mary, Elizabeth did not have a literal husband or other close kinsmen, but, symbolically, she became wife to her kingdom, mother to her people, and even cousin to England's nobility and sister to a foreign prince.⁵⁶ This fictional family, interestingly, was more able to bolster up the Queen's sovereignty than Mary's genuine marriage and family. At this point, Elizabeth technically transformed the liability of being an unmarried woman to gain political strength, through the fiction of the family.

Regarding the second dissimilarity between Elizabeth and Mary in their cultivation of womanly virtues, Elizabeth made use of sexual ambiguity extensively in her rhetoric and associated herself not only with female roles, but also with the male ones, in particular a husband and father. In 1596, when a minister asked the Queen's opinion of the right of Sir Thomas Arundel to take precedence in England because of a foreign honour which he had received, Elizabeth replied, that "there is a close tie of affection between sovereigns and their subjects; and as chaste wives

⁵⁶ Lena Cowen Orlin, "The Fictional Families of Elizabeth I," 85-110.

should have no eyes but for their husbands, so faithful liegemen should keep their regards at home and not look after foreign crowns. For my part I like not for my sheep to wear a stranger's mark nor to dance after a foreigner's whistle."⁵⁷ In this conversation, Elizabeth positioned herself as the husband of all English people and requested their complete allegiance. Again, to fashion herself as a father and particularly as her own father, Elizabeth told her first parliament of 1559 that "we hope to rule, govern and keep this our realm in as good justice, peace and rest, in like wise as the king my father held you in."⁵⁸ The image of a father was indeed a stronger appeal to her subjects' obedience by its analogy with courage, strength, and wisdom, compared to the metaphor of motherhood which customarily carried the virtues of care, mercy, and nurture.⁵⁹ Similarly, in her discussion of suppressing the Northern Rebellion in 1569, Elizabeth exploited the authority of a father emphatically:

First, we [desire] all persons to understand, that of our own natural disposition, through God's goodness, we have been always desirous to have the obedience of all our subjects of all sorts, both high and low, by love and not by compulsion, by their own yielding and not by our exacting, allowing that which was well said by a wise prince of the Greeks: 'That king to be in most surety that so ruled over his subjects as a father over the children.'⁶⁰

⁵⁷ *The Sayings of Queen Elizabeth*, 156.

⁵⁸ Cited in Christopher Haigh, *Elizabeth I* (London: Longman, 1988), 21.

⁵⁹ Orlin, "The Fictional Families of Elizabeth I," 92.

⁶⁰ "A Declaration of the Queenes proceedings since her Reigne" (1569), in *A Collection of State Papers . . . left by William Cecil, Lord Burghley*, eds., Samuel Haynes and William Murdin (London: 1740-59), 583-93; reprinted in George P Rice ed., *The Public Speaking of Queen Elizabeth: Selection from her Official Addresses* (New York: AMS Press, 1966), 127.

The imagery of a father in this speech gave Elizabeth a strong justification for her action of suppression, suggesting that she wielded the absolute power of a father in the household.

Elizabeth indeed frequently manoeuvred the arts of rhetoric to circumvent the innate disadvantage of her sex and created a kind of fictional male identity, while she acknowledged the inferiority of her gender in the existing social hierarchy. As in her speech responding to the Commons' petition of setting the succession order in 1563, she told members of parliament that "the weight and greatenes of this matter might cause in me, being a woman wanting both witt and memory, some feare to speake, and bashfulnes besides, a thing appropriat to my sex. But yet the princely sete and kingly throne wherin God, (though unworthy) hath constituted me, maketh these two causes to seme litle in myne eyes"⁶¹ Therefore, she put aside her female humility by virtue of her position as a prince and manfully asserted that this matter should be left undecided until she felt the time suitable. Similarly, in her oration to Cambridge University in 1564, she stated that "although my feminine modesty might deter me from making a speech and uttering these rude, off-hand remarks in so great an assembly of most learned men, nevertheless the intercession of my nobles and my own goodwill toward the University have prevailed upon me to say something."⁶² Her general strategy was, first, to make a concession to popular perception of the female sex; next, to single out her uniqueness or distinction from

⁶¹ On 28 January, 1563, *Parliaments*, I, 94.

⁶² "Latin Oration at Cambridge University" (1564), in *The Public Speaking of Queen Elizabeth*, 71-72.

other women by a contrary statement, and finally to usher in her masculine qualities as a powerful prince.⁶³ This strategy was more obviously exhibited in another speech to the delegation from the parliament in 1566. Elizabeth presented herself as bravely as she could, declaring that “for my owne parte I care not for deathe, for all men are mortell; and thowghe I be a women yet I have as good a corage awnswerable to mye place as evere my fathere hade.”⁶⁴

Elizabeth fused male and female identities and displayed her masculine courage and bravery more earnestly when she faced foreign threats. In her confrontation with the King of Spain during 1587 and 1588 particularly, she alluded to herself almost as a man, as one of the Spanish ambassadors reported that “the Queen was raving about the [Spanish] seizures in France, saying that although she was a *woman* and her profession was to try to preserve peace with neighbouring princes, yet if they attacked her they would find that in war she could be better than a *man*.”⁶⁵ The imagery of a manly queen culminated in 1588, in her famous speech at Tilbury: “I know I have the body of a weak and feeble woman, but I have the heart and stomach of a king, and of a king of England too.”⁶⁶ The expression of “a man’s heart” was reiterated intensively during this period; in conversations with the Swedish ambassador, Elizabeth stated that “I have the heart of a man, not a woman, and I am

⁶³ For more about Elizabeth rhetoric strategy see Janet M. Green, “‘I My Self’: Queen Elizabeth I’s Oration at Tilbury Camp,” *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 28-2 (1997): 421-45.

⁶⁴ “Queen’s speech to delegation from both Houses,” on 5 November 1566, *Parliaments*, I, 148.

⁶⁵ Sampson’s Advices from England, 26 February 1587, *CSP Spain*, IV, 17-18. The accentuation is mine.

⁶⁶ Cited in Neale, *Queen Elizabeth*, 298. For more about this oration see Susan Frye, “The Myth of Elizabeth at Tilbury,” *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 23-1 (1992): 95-114; Green, “‘I My Self’: Queen Elizabeth I’s Oration at Tilbury Camp.”

not afraid of anything;" and with the French ambassador, that "will I suffer either the King of Spain or Guise to mock this poor old woman, who, in my female form, carries the heart of a man."⁶⁷ The doubling of male and female roles created a wider ground for effective female rule for Elizabeth than Queen Mary's concentration on female identity. Elizabeth's adroit rhetoric enabled her to demonstrate her womanly virtues of modesty and humbleness, as well as to present the masculine image which had brought great advantage to preceding male rulers, like her own father.

In her late years, Elizabeth employed this strategy with even more skill than before, as when she recalled the peacefulness of her rule in 1593:

It may be thought simplicity in me that all this tyme of my raigne [I] have not sought to advance my territories and enlarged my dominions, ffor both opportunity hath served me to doe it and my strength was able to have done it. I acknowledge my womanwood and weaknesse in that respect. But it hath not bene feare to obtayne or doubt how to keepe the thinges so obtayned that hath withholden me from these attemptes: only my mynde was never to invade my neighbours nor to usurpe uppon any, only contented to raigne over my owne and to rule as a iuste prince.⁶⁸

Elizabeth, having acknowledged her womanly weakness without any reluctance, none the less immediately diverted the speech to mirror her heroic quality and courage, like a warrior-queen, in reproaching the King of Spain's threats:

I feare not all his threatninges; his great preparations and mighty forces doe not scarre me. For though he come against me with a greater force then ever was his invincible navye, I doubt not (God assistinge me uppon whom I allways trust) but I shall be able to defeate him and utterly overthrowe him. . . . I heard say that when he attempted his laste invasion some inhabiting

⁶⁷ *The Sayings of Queen Elizabeth*, 16, 18.

⁶⁸ On 10 April 1593, *Parliaments*, III, 173-74.

uppon the costes forsooke the townes and fledd upp higher into the contrye, leaving all naked and exposed to his entrance. But I sweare unto you if I knewe those persons or may know of any that shall so doe hereafter, I will make them knowe and feele what it is to be so fearfull in so urgent a cause.”⁶⁹

She proclaimed her capacity to ensure her people’s safety and tranquillity under her rule, and therefore her ability to rule, which was the key issue for a female ruler.

Taken as a whole, Queen Elizabeth not only magnified her private virtues to be associated with her political virtues, but also keenly partook of the undertone of masculinity in her female body. Although it created sexual ambiguity, it produced clear and effective support to her regal power. As Christopher Haigh comments of Elizabeth’s self-fashioning, “she was not just a virgin, but a virgin of Mary-like significance; was not just a wife, but the wife of the realm; not just a mother, but the mother of the English people and the English Church.”⁷⁰ Actually, Elizabeth was not only a virgin or a special woman, but also a man; was not only the wife of the English nation, but also the husband; not only the mother of all English people, but also the father. Elizabeth’s manufacture of double identities also influenced her subjects’ perception of the Queen, as Anthony Munday praised: “her Highness is the most louing Mother and Nurse of all her good Subiectes, and is lykewise the husband of the common weale, married to the Realme, and the same by ceremony of Ring as solemnly signified, as any other marriage.”⁷¹

⁶⁹ Ibid., 174.

⁷⁰ Haigh, *Elizabeth I*, 20.

⁷¹ Anthony Munday, *A Watch-woord to England to Beward of Traytours and Tretcherous Practises* (London: printed for Thomas Hacket, 1584, *STC* 18282), sig. A3r.

Elizabeth's fusion of masculinity in femininity realised the ideal picture of queenly virtues—the combination of feminine and masculine qualities. Her success primarily relied on her skill of rhetoric, which she had gained from her early education. In comparison with Mary, Elizabeth was given more training in Latin and Greek rhetoric by Roger Ascham, and had imitated the works of Isocrates and Cicero, the two greatest classical masters of political rhetoric, on a daily basis during 1548 and 1550. Ascham extolled Elizabeth's achievement in rhetoric in his letter to Jacob Sturm, saying that his student preferred a style "that grows out of the subject, chaste in its appropriateness, beautiful in its clarity. She admires, above all, modest metaphors and comparisons of contraries well put together and contrasting felicitously with one another."⁷² As in all the words we quoted from Elizabeth, she indeed held a distinctive style, using metaphors, such as a virgin wax, and exploiting contraries or antitheses as she stated: "I know I have a body of a weak and feeble woman, but I have the heart and stomach of a king." More significantly, she was highly competent in expressing sentiment to her audience as she referred to herself as the most careful mother and devoted wife to her subjects. This theatrical and fictional use of motherhood and wifedom stimulated striking emotional feedback amongst her subjects; as John Harington indicated, Elizabeth's speech "did win all affections, and her subjects did try to show all love to her commands."⁷³ However, aside from the training of her humanist education, the overwhelming emphasis on

⁷² Cited in Neale, *Queen Elizabeth*, 26.

⁷³ John Harington, *The Letters of Epigrams of Sir John Harington*, ed. Norman E. McClure (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1930), 122.

rhetoric in the Italian manuals of self-fashioning was also likely to have reinforced Elizabeth's awareness of exercising effective rhetoric in public. Elizabeth perhaps refurbished her craft of rhetoric by Castiglione's teaching, which guided a courtier to speak in a tone to arouse the audience's deepest emotions, "kindling and stirring them as the need arises," and "to use certain words in a metaphorical sense, whenever it is appropriate, putting them to novel use like a gardener grafting a branch on to a healthier trunk, and so increasing their attractiveness and beauty."⁷⁴ Elizabeth's fusing of femininity and masculinity was indeed an innovation consistent with Castiglione's recommendation, beneficial to the task of transforming her sexual disadvantage into a supreme political virtue.

III. The master of princely virtues

Another important dimension of Elizabeth's representation was her princely/heroic qualities, such as justice, temperance, prudence, fortitude and piety, but modern scholarship has devoted far less attention to Elizabeth's cultivation of these masculine qualities than to her female virtue of virginity. Elizabeth's awareness of princely virtues partly sprang from her early education, which let her become acquainted with the classical moralists, and partly from her assimilation of the Italian "mirror-for-princes." The classical authors she read, including Cicero, Livy, Isocrates, Demosthenes, and Plutarch, taught political wisdom and virtues for

⁷⁴ Castiglione, *The Book of the Courtier*, 78.

male citizens and princes, which were sustained by Renaissance Italian humanism. Nevertheless, to some degree, Elizabeth's disturbing childhood and harsh experience also had impact on her cultivation of masculine qualities.⁷⁵ She had developed a sort of self-identity as a man in her early age. According to Ascham's letter to Sturm, Elizabeth's mind "has no womanly weakness, her perseverance is equal to that of a man."⁷⁶ In order to convince his friend of the truth of this, Ascham added "I am inventing nothing, my dear Sturm; there is no need." Elizabeth indeed trained herself to develop a manly spirit and strength, although her humanist education concentrated on developing the princess's womanly virtues.

In 1586, Elizabeth expressed a distinctive fashioning of her princely virtues in her speech to the parliamentary representatives:

. . . bethinking my self of those things that best fitted a kinge, justice, temper, magnanimitie, judgment; . . .⁷⁷ For the two latter I will not boast.

⁷⁵ Wallace T. MacCaffrey suggests that "her cool pragmatism owed more to her own harsh experience than to any bookish instruction," in his *Elizabeth I* (London: Edward Arnold, 1993), 7.

⁷⁶ Cited in Neale, *Queen Elizabeth*, 26.

⁷⁷ The words omitted here are: "for I found it most requisite that a prince shold be endued with justice, that he shold be adorned with temperance, I conceived magnanimitie to beseeme a royal estate possessed by whatsoever sex, and that it was necessarie that such a person shold be of judgment. Of which last two I will not speake, for that I am not greatlie troubled with them and yet I remember well that Salamon saith, that nothings is more requisite for a king then judgment: for the first, this maie I truely saye, that I was never led to consent to anie thinge that I thought uniust, I never preferred anie in respect of the preferrer, if I thought him not my self worthie of the preferment, nor ever in matter of justice respected the person to the alteration of my censure; I never lent my eare to corrupt my iudgment, or changed my opionion of any, but by the iust motion of those, that weare by me put in trust, to examyne the cause, wherein as in a thing common ato all Princes I must of force use some for theire advice, yet will I this take upon me that to my knowledg."

They are shown in B. L. Lansdowne MSS. 94, f.87, however, are not shown on the printed text, such as William Camden's *The History of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princess Elizabeth, Late Queen of England* (London, 1688) and William Leigh's *Queen Elizabeth, Paraleld in her Princely Vertues with David, Iosua and Hezekia, in three sermons as they were preched three seuerall Queenes dayes* (London, 1612, STC 15426), both of which have a version based on the printed text.

Significantly, Elizabeth treated the four virtues without any concession by her sex in the version of the manuscript. Nevertheless, in the Camden's version and Leigh's, she was much more aware of her female humbleness. Leigh recorded the Queen's speech as that "a Prince (saith shee) is scant well furnished, if either hee lacke Iustice, Temprance, Magnanimitie, or Iudgement: As for the two later, I will not boast, my Sexe doth not permit it, but for the two first, this dare I say, . . .," sig. l5v.

But for the two first this may I truly say: among my subiectes I never knew a difference of person wheare right was one, nor never to my knowledge preferred for favour what I thought not fitt for worth, nor bent myne eares to credit a tale that first was told me, nor was so rashe to corrupt my iudgement with my censure er I heard the cause. I will not say but many reportes might fortune be brought me by suche as must heare the matter whose partiality might marre the right, for we princes cannot heare all causes our selves. But this dare I boldly affirme my verdict want [ever] with the truth of my knowledg. [As it was] but ful wel wished [by] Alcibiades [to] his frend that he shold not give anie aunswere till he had recited the letters of the alphabet, so have I not used over sodaine resolutions in matters [of anie weight nor determyned oft without deliberation] that have touched me full nere.⁷⁸

Justice, temperance, magnanimity and judgement, the four kingly virtues which Elizabeth presented, were the transposition of the classical four cardinal virtues which were particularly stressed by Italian humanists. Amongst the four princely virtues, justice in particular was viewed by Elizabeth as the most important virtue for a monarch, and she apparently viewed herself as the embodiment of justice.

She accentuated her virtue of justice again in her parliamentary speech of 1593, pronouncing that “this kingdome hath had many noble and victorious princes. I will not compare with any of them in wisdome, fortitude, and other virtues, but (saving the duty of a chylde that is not to compare with her father) in love, care, sincerity, iustice I will compare with any prince that ever you had or ever shall have;” then she stressed that “my mynde was never to invade my neighbours nor to usurpe uppon any, only contented to raigne over my owne and to rule as a iuste prince.”⁷⁹ As a

More obvious gender-conscious in Camden’s version that the Queen stated that “. . . Of the two latter I will not boast my self, my Sex doth not permit it, they are proper to Men. But for the two former and less rough, I dare say, (and that without Ostentation) . . .,” *The History of . . . Princess Elizabeth*, ed. Wallace T. MacCaffrey (Chicago: the University of Chicago Press, 1970), 265.

⁷⁸ On 24 November 1586, *Parliaments*, II, 268-69.

⁷⁹ On 10 April 1593, *Parliaments*, III, 173, 174.

just prince, Elizabeth furthermore demonstrated her flawless justice in dealing with the controversies of political policies in 1601, stating that

first civillye: your selves can witnesse that I never enterid into the examination of anie cause without advisement carienge ever a single eie to iustice and truth, for though I wear contente to hear matters argued and debated *pro* and *contra* as all princis must that will understand what is right, yet I took ever as it wear uppon a plaine talbe wherin is written neither partialitie nor preiudice.⁸⁰

Another remarkable princely virtue which Elizabeth zealously cultivated was to keep “a prince’s word.” This idea originated from her learning of Isocrates’ *To Nicocles*, which admonished the monarch that “through out all your life show that you value truth so highly that your word is more to be trusted than the oaths of other men.”⁸¹ Besides, it was also an echo of Italian humanists’ advice to princes to keep their promises—as Giovanni Pontano stressed in his *De Principe* (1468) that “nothing is more disgraceful” than a prince “not keeping his word.”⁸² Elizabeth frequently employed this term to assert that her every word carried incontestable regal authority and people should have absolute faith in it. Significantly, she proclaimed the unquestionable certainty of her word particularly during the

⁸⁰ *Queen Elizabeth’s Last Speech*, 19 December 1601, *Parliaments*, III, 278.

⁸¹ Cited in Frye, *Elizabeth I*, 4. Elizabeth was well instructed under humanist education, concentrating on liberal arts, when she was the Princess. According to Roger Ascham, who was the tutor of the Princess since 1548, Elizabeth read the best of the ancients, Greek in the mornings and Latin in the afternoons, together with the successful pedagogical technique of “double translation.” Ascham recalled that he and the Princess diligently took this “double translation of Demosthenes and Isocrates daily without missing every forenoon, and likewise some part of Tully every afternoon, for the space of a year or two.” Roger Ascham, *The Schoolmaster* (1570), ed. Lawrence V. Ryan (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, published for the Folger Shakespeare Library, 1967), 87. Undoubtedly, Elizabeth was perfectly familiar with Isocrates’ words and attained terrific understanding of the art of rhetoric as well as other knowledge.

⁸² Cited in Quentin Skinner, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, I (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), 128.

controversy of her marriage. She stated in 1563 that “there can be no duear debt then princes’ worde,” and further emphasised her determination of marriage in 1566 that “I wyll never breke the worde of a prince spoken in publyke place, for my honour sake.”⁸³ Although people were always sceptical of her sincerity in marriage, Elizabeth continually claimed that she was always bound by her word through her whole reign. She seemed serious in keeping her word and, in 1596, proudly declared to Henry IV, King of France, that her faith and word “have never yet received spot,” and to James VI, King of Scotland, that “I never yet begiled the powrest vassal with a broken worde.”⁸⁴ Nevertheless, she did in fact modify her promises in accordance with the political reality. As in the case of her matrimonial negotiations, she could give an assurance of marriage to one suitor, but soon changed her language to promise merely a tie of friendship because of her councillors’ aggressive protest.⁸⁵ Therefore, Elizabeth actually demonstrated more a degree of dissimulation and political pragmatism rather than a genuine commitment to her words. She, in this respect, resembled Machiavelli’s pragmatism and his observation that “everyone realised how praiseworthy it is for a prince to honour his word and to be straightforward rather than crafty in his dealings; none the less contemporary experience shows that princes who have achieved great things have been those who have given their word lightly.”⁸⁶ Manipulating the princely image

⁸³ *Parliaments*, I, 115, 147. See also Chapter 6, section II.

⁸⁴ Elizabeth to Henry IV, King of France, 1 September 1596, in Harrison, 246; Elizabeth to James VI, King of Scotland, in *Letters of Queen Elizabeth and King James VI of Scotland*, ed. John Bruce (London: Camden Society, 46, 1849), 173

⁸⁵ See Chapter 6.

⁸⁶ Machiavelli, *The Prince*, 54.

of honouring her words was indeed more important for Elizabeth than truly to be bound by her promise.

Apart from those virtues, religion was vital to Elizabeth's image-making. She endeavoured to preserve "a public face of piety" long before she succeeded to the throne,⁸⁷ and she was indeed brought up in a dominant Protestant atmosphere as mentioned in the beginning of this chapter. Contemporary scholarship has been less suspicious of Elizabeth's sincerity in the Protestant faith than the generation of A. F. Pollard who believed that Elizabeth was "sceptical or indifferent" in religion.⁸⁸ Historians today generally agree that "there can be little doubt of Elizabeth's personal Protestantism," as Christopher Haigh suggests.⁸⁹ Elizabeth clearly was not hesitant to take on a Protestant image, as in 1558, she walked out of her Christmas mass at the bishop of Carlisle's elevation of the Host. The Spanish ambassador Count de Feria also reported that Elizabeth heard mass on another day by another bishop "who was requested not to elevate the Host and acted accordingly," so the Queen heard it to the end.⁹⁰

Elizabeth expressed her piety zealously toward God in public, in her late reign in particular. In 1585, she told the parliament that she grounded her whole rule and

⁸⁷ Haigh, *Elizabeth I*, 27.

⁸⁸ A. F. Pollard, *The History of England from the Accession of Edward VI to the Death of Elizabeth (1547-1603)*, in the series of the Political History of England, VI (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1910), 180.

⁸⁹ Haigh, *Elizabeth I*, 28. Similar view see William P. Haugaard, "Elizabeth Tudor's *Book of Devotions*: a Neglected Clue to the Queen's Life and Character," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 22-2 (1981): 79-105; Susan Doran, *Elizabeth I and Religion, 1558-1603* (London: Routledge, 1994), 6-9; Patrick Collinson, "Windows in a Woman's Soul: Questions about the Religion of Queen Elizabeth I," in his *Elizabethan Essays*, 87-118.

⁹⁰ Count de Feria to the King, 29 December 1558, *CSP Spain*, II, 17.

life in the faith in God, for “one matter towchethe me so nere, as I may not ovarskepe: religion, the grownd on which all other matters owght to take roote, and beinge corrupted maye mare all the tree.” She continued to expressed more sentiment in God’s guidance, stating that

I am supposed to have many stoodies, And yet amydst my many volumes I hope God’s booke hath not bene my seldomest lectures, in which we finde that which by reason (for my parte) we owght to beleve: that seinge so great wickednes and greves in the worlde, in which we lyve but as wayefaringe pilgrymes, we must comforte then we find here.⁹¹

Furthermore, in 1586, Elizabeth promised to firmly build the Protestant faith and God’s Church in her land, for that religion as she declared was the one “I was borne in [and], bread in, and [wherein I hope to] I trust shall die in.”⁹²

Elizabeth’s claim of sincerity and constancy in the Protestant faith, however, was incompatible with her religious settlement which was modelled with a sense of conciliation with Catholicism. Elizabeth conspicuously retained a sense of political pragmatism in meddling with religious affairs, although her personal faith in Protestantism is indisputable. Her primary concern was to maintain unity in a state where people were divided by religion. The strategy was to compromise between Protestantism (including every principal type of Protestantism) and Catholicism. Therefore, during the ecclesiastical disputation of 1559-63, Elizabeth refused a consummate Protestant reform in the English Church and made concessions to the Catholics on the issues of the music, the priests’ dress, the rubric, the liturgy and

⁹¹ On 29 March 1585, *Parliaments*, II, 31. 32.

⁹² On 24 November 1586, *ibid.*, II, 268.

even her title as the “Supreme Governor of the Church of England,” instead of “Supreme Head.”⁹³ Generally speaking, Elizabeth was soft on Catholics and avoided provoking Catholic opposition. Indeed, as Haigh states, “Elizabeth wanted to be queen of the English, not queen of the Protestants,” her moderate approach to church reform successfully associated conservatives with her regime and gained the political allegiance of the majority of her Catholic subjects.⁹⁴ Elizabeth’s attitude of reconciliation was also demonstrated in her representations: she did not refuse to be mirrored as the Virgin Queen, a significant icon of Catholicism, while she was associated with the Old Testament kings, which was a Protestant-centred theme as it will be shown in the next section. Elizabeth’s pragmatic religious policy ultimately served to promote the Anglican Church, where the Queen was the central piece of worship.

Elizabethan religious policy was greatly beneficial for the Queen’s image-making as a peaceful ruler, forming a distinct contrast to the bloody persecution inflamed by Mary Tudor, or to the St. Bartholomew’s Day massacre which had happened in France in the regency of Catherine de Medici. She herself was very conscious of her image as a “Prince of Peace,” fond of contrasting the religious situation of England with troubled countries elsewhere in Europe and declaring that,

⁹³ For the Elizabethan church reformation, see Patrick Collinson, *The Religion of Protestants: the Church in English Society 1559-1625* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982); Doran, *Elizabeth I and Religion*; Claire Cross, *The Royal Supremacy in the Elizabethan Church* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1969); W. P. Haugaard, *Elizabeth and the English Reformation: the Struggle for a Stable Settlement of Religion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970).

⁹⁴ Haigh, *Elizabeth*, 36. For Catholic allegiance to the Queen, see John Bossy, *The English Catholic Community, 1570-1850* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1975), 37-42.

We leave to all wise persons to consider by way of comparison, what difference is to be found betwixt the security, the tranquillity, the wealth, and all other worldly felicities, which our obedient people do and may enjoy in this our government, and the contraries in other kingdoms and countries; as continual and universal outrage, bloodsheds, murders, burnings, spoilings, depopulations of towns and countries and therewith infinite manners of exaction, and such like, properly conjoined with civil wars.⁹⁵

Elizabeth expressed her pacifism further by frequent stress on her loathing of wars, even the war with the Spanish Armada, and declared herself preferring instead the reputation of a peaceful ruler. She proclaimed in several speeches that she had never sought to enlarge the territories of her land, and any wars waged by her were only for defence of herself and her loving subjects. As in her final parliamentary speech in 1601, Elizabeth declared that she “never gave iuste cause of warr to any prince;” her greatest ambition was only to “mainteyne my owne state in securitie and peace without being gilty to my owne self of offering or entendinge iniurie to any man.”⁹⁶

As a whole, Elizabeth represented herself as the living model of princely virtues. In particular, in the latter half of her reign, Elizabeth developed her self-fashioning of princely virtues more conspicuously and she took upon herself the role of schoolmaster to instruct other immature practitioners of statecraft. Elizabeth was very conscious of her seniority among European monarchs and of her mastery of the king’s craft, out of the conviction that she had been trained through long experience and involvement in public affairs.⁹⁷ The correspondence between her and James VI,

⁹⁵ *Elizabeth’s Defense of her Proceedings in Church and State* (1569), cited in Haugaard, “Elizabeth Tudor’s *Book of Devotions*,” 100.

⁹⁶ On 19 December 1601, *Parliaments*, III, 279.

⁹⁷ MacCaffrey, *Elizabeth I*, 441.

the future King of England (James I), during the 1580s and the 1590s, is the most noteworthy evidence showing Elizabeth defined herself as a mentor of other European kings. Certainly, Elizabeth would instruct James in accordance with England's interests with little real care for James's own benefit or Scotland's. She was prepared to push James relentlessly to do her will, for example, by suppressing Scottish Catholic nobles. Nevertheless, as Wallace MacCaffrey suggests, James's desire to inherit the English throne made him the Queen's prisoner and her awareness of this fact led her to treat him with a imperious superiority, criticising his failures in a tone suggesting that King James was an inept and senseless pupil.⁹⁸

Their correspondence is useful for our understanding of Elizabeth's representation of princely virtues. In many respects, Elizabeth's instruction of James displayed the essence of her own princely virtues and she usually used herself as a model for James to emulate. One of the lessons of Elizabeth's teaching the art of kingship was the idea of "a prince's word" which demanded that a prince keep his promise. She wrote to James in 1583 as he failed to keep his promise to maintain amity with her and follow her counsel in Scottish affairs; hence, she recommended the lesson that she had learned from Isocrates:

Among your many studies, my dear Brother and Cousin, I would Isocrates' noble lesson were not forgotten, that wills the Emperor his sovereign to make his words of more account than other their oaths, as meetest ensigns to show the truest badge of a Prince's arms. It moveth me much to move you, when I behold how diversely sundry wicked paths, and, like all evil

⁹⁸ Ibid. In late 1593 or early 1594, James attempted to disclose his resentment of Elizabeth's continual advice, though slightly, see Orlin, "The Fictional Families of Elizabeth I," 100.

illusions, wrapped under the cloak of your best safety, endanger your state and best good.⁹⁹

Unsurprisingly, Elizabeth did not teach James her own version of this idea that of treating her words in accordance with political reality, but simply demanded the King to follow her will and to be bound inflexibly by his promise.

In another lesson, Elizabeth guided King James to exercise his kingly authority. First, she asked James to assume the kingly role of justice as she herself was its incarnation. In 1589, she wrote to the King to direct him how to tackle the Catholic rebels, stating that “God forbid you should lose the reputation of a king-like rule, that so unlike a king, would work your own reproche. For they be actions, not words, wich paynts out kings truly in their coulours. . . . I beseech you, therefore, despise not the work that God hath fraimed, . . . but finish this treason with justice, wich no man may reproch, but every creature laude.”¹⁰⁰ Second, King James should demonstrate the king’s absolute power, independent of his councillors’ control and influence, as she wrote to James that “must a King be prescribed what Councillors he will take as if you were their ward? Shall you be obliged to tie or undo what they list make or revoke?” Therefore, Elizabeth demanded that the King bear the kingly qualities of courage and fortitude, and to “show you worthy the place” and “to make you loved and feared” if he meant to perpetuate his reign.¹⁰¹ However, to be both loved and feared was difficult for a king as Machiavelli maintained. Hence,

⁹⁹ Elizabeth to James VI, 7 August 1583, in Harrison, 159.

¹⁰⁰ Elizabeth to James VI, 19 May 1589, in *Letters of Queen Elizabeth and King James VI of Scotland*, ed. Bruce, 164.

¹⁰¹ Elizabeth to James VI, 11 September 1592, Harrison, 221.

Elizabeth subsequently followed Machiavelli's opinion—"it is far better to be feared than loved if you cannot be both"¹⁰²—and particularly exhorted James to make his subjects fear his power and therefore obey his authority. She thus suggested to James that a king was meant to be obeyed, rather than suffer indignity and rebellion:

Who to peril a King were inventors or actors, they should crack a halter if I were King. Such is my charity. Who under pretence of bettering your estate, endangers the King, or needs will be his schoolmasters, if I might appoint their university they should be assigned to learn first to obey; so should they better teach you next. I am not so unskilful of a kingly rule that I would wink at no fault, yet would be open-eyed at public indignity.¹⁰³

Elizabeth then admonished King James further to make his subjects aware of his power, and not to allow them to tell him what he ought to do. Elizabeth said in a tone of superiority and contempt of the King's ineptitude, that "if you wyl, though you haue not, or had, as you did not, kingly and resolutly, make your unsound subiectz knowe your power, and not to overslip suche as by strangers helpe may danger you and yours, nether shuld your subiectz nede tel you what you aught, nor they dare to mucche presume of what they may."¹⁰⁴

It is notable that the correspondence between these two sovereigns did not remain in private; it was customarily collected by royal secretaries for other public functionaries.¹⁰⁵ Ultimately, Elizabeth's tutelage of James as a whole was not only a tool to bend James to her will, but also a means to fashion herself as an experienced and powerful king in the eyes of her people. Moreover, in her correspondence with

¹⁰² Machiavelli, *The Prince*, 52.

¹⁰³ Elizabeth to James VI, 11 September 1592, Harrison, 222.

¹⁰⁴ Elizabeth to James VI, September 1593, *Letters of Queen Elizabeth*, 85.

¹⁰⁵ See "Introduction," in *Letters of Queen Elizabeth*.

King James, Elizabeth frequently used the term “king,” rather than queen or sovereign, to refer to herself; as she said that “I am not so unskilful of a kingly rule. . . ,” she actually hinted to the contrary. Elizabeth indeed attempted to emphasise a masculine image as a king who practised the kingly craft perfectly and fulfilled the masculine virtues. Thus, she could proudly look down on all other kings and claim herself to be the best Prince that English people ever had, or would have, emphasising that “there was never anie Prince more beholding unto her subiectes then I [am un]to youe, so was there never prince, more willing to do youe good then I in my minde, though I may fayle in the means.”¹⁰⁶

However, more smartly, Elizabeth did not miss the chance to exploit the metaphor of motherhood as she did towards her people, while simultaneously educating King James in the art of kingship in a virile and high-handed tone. In 1592, she wrote to James in a tone of a mother, stressing her care of his “prosperous estate and quiet” since his birth.¹⁰⁷ Again, in the letter of 1593, Elizabeth greeted James as her brother in this letter as usual, yet she immediately analogised herself as a tender and careful mother who had looked after her son’s safety and welfare since his birth. Furthermore, Elizabeth enacted the maternal role more obviously in 1593 as she told James that “you know, my dear Brother, that, since you first breathed, I regarded always to conserve it as my womb it had been you bear.”¹⁰⁸ It was not awkward for Elizabeth to use the image of a mother because she was James’s

¹⁰⁶ On 24 November 1586, *Parliaments*, II, 270.

¹⁰⁷ Elizabeth to James VI, 11 September 1592, Harrison, 221.

¹⁰⁸ Elizabeth to James VI, January 1593, *ibid.*, 223.

godmother, however, she meant virtually a natural mother to James in order both to deepen their correlation and win over James' submission. In a way, Elizabeth use of the maternal image after a few years after the death of Mary Stuart, James's mother, who was executed in England in 1587, was a means to soothe James's loss of his biological mother and transfer James's devotion to his old mother to the new mother—the Queen of England. As for James, although he put ice on the Scottish-Anglo relationship, after his mother was executed in Fotheringhay, he, none the less, was still eager to have Elizabeth confirm his right of succession to the English throne. The mother-son metaphor certainly advanced his connection with Elizabeth as if he was her direct heir by blood. James thus welcomed this analogy and willingly complied to Elizabeth's wishes, writing to her in 1593 that "thanking you hairtelie for the honorable disallouing of the disturbairs of my estait, and for your motherlie caire in all my adoes."¹⁰⁹

Elizabeth's utilising of the maternal metaphor was also demonstrated in the conscious tempering of her discourse of masculine qualities with her female tenderness and softness. Further evidence of this is in her address to Parliament in 1586, in which she indicated the four kingly virtues as mentioned above. The printed version of that speech, according to William Camden's and William Leigh's records, shows that the Queen made a notable concession for the sake of her sex, stating that a prince "is scant well furnished, if either hee lacke Iustice, Temprance, Magnanimitie, or Iudgement: As for the two later, I will not boast, my Sexe doth not

¹⁰⁹ James to Elizabeth, 19 September 1593, *Letters of Queen Elizabeth*, 90.

permit it, but for the two first, this dare I say,”¹¹⁰ William Leigh explains that the Queen put off the two later virtues only because of “her Princely modestie,” and himself declares that the Queen’s government furnished with “no less magnanimitie and iudgment” than justice and temperance. Actually, this version would be believable if we consider Elizabeth’s awareness of her amalgamation of virile virtues and female qualities in one person. It is therefore not surprising to find that Elizabeth wanted to add female modesty to her display of princely virtues, while she was fusing masculinity with female qualities.

IV. The mirror for the Queen’s princely virtues

This section explores further representations of Elizabeth’s princely virtues, focusing on the efforts of her Protestant subjects. Although the majority of the Elizabethan panegyric glorified the Queen through female figures and stressed her perfect femininity, there were still some religious works of her Protestant apologists to reflect the Queen’s own concern over masculine qualities. They, unlike other Elizabethan panegyrists, gave advice and represented the image of the Queen’s godliness through diverse male personae and therefore associated Elizabeth with earlier great Christian kings and prophets. Their original concern was religion and they, like Queen Mary’s Catholic apologists, were well aware that the prosperity of English Protestantism relied heavily on the glorification of the Queen and the

¹¹⁰ See note 77 above.

advancement of her piety towards the “true faith,” whether they sincerely accepted the female rule or not. In addition, their primary intention of consolidating an English Church drove their works to address not only the Queen, but more importantly, the English public.

The earliest case of linking Elizabeth with a male figure and princely virtues was made by John Foxe in his first English printing version of *Acts and Monuments* in 1563, dedicated to Queen Elizabeth.¹¹¹ In the very beginning of his preface to the Queen, the capital C of “Constantine” encloses a portrait of Elizabeth, sitting on the throne holding the sword and orb (Figure 6). This visual representation draws the readers’ first attention to the idea that Emperor Constantine prefigures Elizabeth’s rule and virtue. Then, Foxe draws a comparison between the ending of the persecution of the early church by the first Christian Emperor, Constantine, and that of the sufferings of the English reformed church by Elizabeth. He thus illustrates the marvellous resemblance between Elizabeth and Constantine by their “memorable doinges,” and reminds the reader that Constantine also had English blood since he was the son of an English woman, Helen.¹¹² More significantly, Foxe declares that both Elizabeth and Constantine are the instruments of God, who sent them down “to cease bloud, to staye persecution, to refreshe his people,” and “to quench fier brandes, to assage rage, to releaue innocentes.” Their reigns therefore clearly

¹¹¹ For John Foxe’s idea of queenship see Carole Levin, “John Foxe and the Responsibilities of Queenship,” in *Women in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance: Literary and Historical Perspectives*, ed. Mary Beth Rose (New York: Syracuse University Press, 1986), 113-33.

¹¹² John Foxe, *Actes and Monuments* (London: John Day, 1563, STC 11222), sig. B1v, B1r.

manifested the grace and triumph of God.¹¹³ However, Foxe is convinced that Elizabeth is superior to Constantine in one respect in that “Constantinus, being only but an helper vnto the persecuted, your highnes hath dispatched that persecution from other, under which ye were entangled your selfe: and that chiefly (what so euer they pretended) for the truthe of your profession.”¹¹⁴ This statement highlights Elizabeth’s suffering and imprisonment under the reign of Mary, which greatly enhances the Queen’s image of piety.

After John Foxe’s work, the analogy of Elizabeth as a valiant king appeared frequently. As her reign progressed, the Old Testament kings, Solomon and David in particular, displaced Constantine and became the pattern for the Queen’s Protestant supporters in order to demonstrate her authority and piety.¹¹⁵ King Solomon, renowned for his wisdom, wealth and peaceful rule, could readily be identified with Elizabeth in her princely virtues and prosperous reign; David, a providential ruler and builder of the Christian Church, was a suitable image to be identified with Elizabeth to mirror her victory over idolatry and popery. As in Thomas Rogers’s *A Golden Chaine* (1579), the author declares that the dedication of his work to Elizabeth results from “the wonderful resemblance” between the Queen and King Solomon and King David. He identifies the Queen with Solomon, who “at home so beloued of his own subiectes; and abroade so honored of forraine nations,” to praise the Queen’s princely virtues of wisdom, peace, justice and

¹¹³ Ibid., sig. B1v.

¹¹⁴ Ibid., sig. B2r.

¹¹⁵ King, *Tudor Royal Iconography*, 255.

wealth.¹¹⁶ He also declares the likeness between King David and Elizabeth, which consists in David's "foiling of Goliath with your Maiesties ouerthrowing the Pope; His rooting out of the Philistines with your Maiesties suppressing the Papistes; his affliction with your imprisonment; his persecution with your troubles; his singing of godlie songes with your godlie bookes; his loue of his God, with your promoting his glorie and defending of pure religion."¹¹⁷ He thus signifies the Queen's godliness and likens her promotion of the reformed church to the glorious work of King David.

In addition, biblical prophets, such as Moses and Samuel, were employed alongside these kings to mirror Elizabeth's godliness. Thomas Bently in his *The Monument of Matrons* (1582) hails the Queen's heroic qualities and piety highly for her joining "with Moses piainfullie leade them out of the deserts of errour and oppression; and with Iosua, bring they people into the land of promise, . . . with Hezekias and Iosias roote out and destroie all superstition and relikes of idolatrie, with David and Salomon finish and consecrate to eternitie they glorious Temple among thy people."¹¹⁸

The use of ancient Israelite kings and prophets to express Elizabeth's extraordinary power, piety and princely behaviour, as well as Elizabeth's own fashioning of the princely virtues, has not been sufficiently studied by modern historians. This phenomenon became popular in Elizabeth's later reign, especially

¹¹⁶ Thomas Roger, *A Golden Chaine, Taken out of the Psalmes of King David; also, the pretious pearles of King Salomon* (London: H. Denham, 1579, STC 21235), sig. A5v.

¹¹⁷ Ibid., sig. A5r, A5r-v.

¹¹⁸ Thomas Bently, *The Monument of Matrones: conteining seuen seuerall Lamps of virginite, or distinct treatises, . . .* (London: H. Denham, 1582, STC 1829), the Epitstle; sig. Bb4r-v.

in and after 1579, including Thomas Roger's *A Golden Chaine*, John Foxe's praising of the Queen as King Solomon in his 1596's reprinting of *Acts and Monuments*, and Thomas Morton's *Salmon or a Treatise Declaring the State of the Kingdome of Israel* (1596), which clearly parallels Elizabeth with Solomon in a woodcut in the frontispiece (Figure 7).¹¹⁹ In particular, this theme was most evident in a series of sermons written for the annual celebrations of Elizabeth's Accession Day, the Queen's holy day, on 17 November.

Neither the origins nor the degree of spontaneity of these holidays were clear. According to Thomas Holland's apology for this holiday, "the first publike celebrity of it was instituted in *Oxford* (by *Dr Cooper* being then there Vicechanucelour after Bishop *Of Lincolne*, and by remoue from thence Bishop of Winchester) from whence this institution flowed by a voluntary current over all this Realme."¹²⁰ Although Thomas Holland means to emphasise the annual celebrations as the outpouring of spontaneous popular allegiance, he simultaneously gives us evidence that it might be a result of an officially initiated movement by Dr. Cooper. Roy Strong and Helen Hackett also suggest that the Accession Day was a centrally authorised and promoted festival rather than voluntary popular worship.¹²¹ The motivations behind the celebrations were very likely connected with the political crises around 1569 and

¹¹⁹ Foxe called Elizabeth as the "most deare soueraigne Queen Elizabeh, our peaceable Salome," in the preface of his *Acts and Monuments* (London: Peter Short, 1596, STC 11226). Thomas Morton, *Salmon or a Treatise Declaring the State of the Kingdome of Israel, as it was in the daies of Salomon* (London: Robert Robinson, 1596, STC 18194).

¹²⁰ Thomas Holland, *Sermon Preached at Pavls in London the 17 of November Ann. Dom. 1599. . . wherevnto is adioyned an Apologeticall discourse, . . . for the observing the 17 of November yeerly in the forme of an Holy-day* (Oxford: Joseph Barnes, 1601, STC 13597), sig. N4r.

¹²¹ Strong, *The Cult of Elizabeth*, 119-23; Hackett, *Virgin Mother, Maiden Queen*, 83-87.

1570, namely the Northern Rebellion and the Pope's bull of excommunication of Queen Elizabeth.¹²² The Northern Rebellion was principally the work of Catholics, attempting to displace Elizabeth with Mary Queen of Scots, and alter the English religion. The Pope's bull, connected with this Catholic uprising of 1569, freed the English people from their oath of obedience to the Queen, because it claimed Elizabeth to be a usurper and heretic. The deposition decree of 1570 started hostility between the English state and the papacy. The Elizabethan government afterwards imposed more burdens on Catholic subjects and viewed any expression of obedience to the Pope as an act of disloyalty; on the other hand, the Pope began actively to support Catholic invasions of England and plots against the Queen's life. For the majority of English Catholics, now they had to face a conflict between their religious conscience and civic duty. As for the Elizabethan government, a need to justify the Queen's rule and the English Church therefore arose and a fervent cult of Elizabeth became imperative in order to unite her divided people. It was against this background that the Queen's Accession Day gradually became a national holiday in the 1570s. By the 1580s, it was widely established as a customary calendrical occasion, and the manner of celebrations was also firmly established, including bell-ringing, bonfires and various other festivities held by local officials in provincial towns and parishes. Moreover, ballads and verses for this occasion were printed, and sermons were preached in various places.¹²³

¹²² J. E. Neale, "November 17th," in his *Essays in Elizabethan History* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1958), 10; Strong, *The Cult of Elizabeth*, 119.

¹²³ David Cressy, "Crownation Day and the Royal Honour," in his *Bonfires and Bells: National Memory and the Protestant Calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England* (London: Weidenfeld and

The sermons held for remembrance and thanksgiving for Elizabeth's accession were one of the most important features of the festivities on the Queen's Day as Roy Strong stresses.¹²⁴ What concerns us here is the fact that the sermons consistently framed the Queen alongside the kings and prophets of the Old Testament, which can tell us, on the one hand, a good deal about how those preachers wanted people to perceive the Queen; while on the other hand, what prototype of princely virtues they wished the Queen to cultivate and sustain. We can find from the *Short Title Catalogue* about thirteen sermons (preached by nine of Elizabeth's apologists) for the Accession Day, most of which were printed after 1583 (see the Appendix). The earliest one was preached by Edwin Sandys, the Archbishop of York, in 1579 (printed in 1585).¹²⁵ The year 1579 seemed to be a significant year for the identification of Elizabeth with the biblical male figures and masculine qualities. The same year also appeared to be the turning point when Elizabeth's subjects started conspicuously to portray the Queen as a perpetual virgin in order to sabotage her marriage with the Duke of Alençon.¹²⁶ This coincidence, however, lacks obvious evidence to imply that the sermons had a correlation with the Queen's marriage.

Nicolson, 1989), 51-55. Although there were widespread celebrations for Elizabeth's Accession Day, nevertheless, this holiday was not truly generally accepted by Elizabeth's subjects, particularly opposed by the Catholics. There were also different opinions towards the celebrations amongst the Protestants. For the controversy over the Accession Day, see Hackett, *Virgin Mother, Maiden Queen*, 207-11 and Strong, *The Cult of Elizabeth*, 125-26.

¹²⁴ Strong, *The Cult of Elizabeth*, 124.

¹²⁵ Edwin Sandys in his first sermon mentioned that the reign had been "now twenty years fully finished." See his "A Sermon preached in York, at the celebration of the day of the Queen's entrance into her reign," in *Sermons Made by the Most Reuerende Edwin, Bishop of Yorke* (London: H. Midleton, 1585, *STC* 21713); reprinted in *The Sermons of Edwin Sandys*, ed. John Ayre (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press for Parker Society, 1842), 56.

¹²⁶ See Chapter 6, section IV.

The sermons actually emerged primarily as a response to the Queen's confrontation with the papal church. Nevertheless, it reminds us that the cult of Elizabeth after 1579 was represented in two forms: one focused on her virginity, cultivating Elizabeth's resemblance to the Virgin Mary; the other stressed her masculine qualities, developing the association between the Queen and scriptural male figures and even preceding English rulers. Interestingly, both forms attempted to glorify the Queen's virtues and to reinforce the connection between the Queen, the State and the Church.

It is noteworthy that the sermons reached a larger audience than courtly panegyric which took such forms as plays and masques, attended only by the Queen, the nobles and courtiers. The sermons took place in several different cities and towns: some in St. Pauls, London, which were directed at the city's dignitaries, social and economic elite and higher clergy; some were preached in St. Mary's, Oxford, attended by scholars and important citizens; and some in York and Kent where a large group of local people would have assembled. Therefore, the sermons were more valuable as propaganda than courtly literature because they could address the country as a whole.

All of those sermons intended to perpetuate people's memory of misery and slavery in the former reign of Queen Mary and that of peace and liberty after Elizabeth's accession to the throne with her restoration of Protestantism in England. Furthermore, they all functioned to stir people's deep gratitude to God for his preservation of Elizabeth and to remind them of fighting Catholic enemies along with

their pious Queen. Accordingly, the sermons held two primary themes: one was the Queen's princely rule and virtues, while the other, relating to the former, was the perpetuity of the English Church. For the Queen's virtues, they started their glorification mostly with the idea that the ruler's virtue was the pivot of a country's happiness and tranquillity as the humanists had argued. For instance, John Prime, rector of Adderbury in Oxfordshire, in a sermon in Oxford in 1585 articulates this idea of the decisive influence of the prince's virtues on his subjects, stating that "if the prince bee wise, the people be the wiser; if he be blessed of God, they be most happy. . . . If the head be il, the members cannot prosper: if the blind lead the blind, they both fal into the pit."¹²⁷ Prime, in another sermon preached in Oxford in 1588, similarly describes the prince as "the head and hart of his people," and declares that "all sence is from the head, all life is from the hart."¹²⁸ These sermons then concentrated overwhelmingly on the Queen's piety and princely qualities. Edwin Sandys, in his first sermon preached in York in 1579, represents the Church of England as a vineyard and the Queen as its blessed overseer, who is endued with the qualities of wisdom, learnedness, religion, constancy, and particularly she "passeth all princes" in her justice and mercy.¹²⁹

The typical manner of the sermons' representing the Queen's virtues and her providential rule was to identify the Queen with the Old Testament kings and

¹²⁷ John Prime, *A Sermon Briefly Comparing the Estate of King Salomon and his Subiectes with Queen Elizabeth and her People, preached in sainet Maries in Oxford* (Oxford: J. Barnes, 1585, STC 20371), sig. B2r.

¹²⁸ John Prime, *The Consolations of Daud, breefly applied to queene Elizabeth in a sermon preached in Oxford the 17 of Nouember 1588* (Oxford: J. Barnes, 1588, STC 20368), sig. Biv.

¹²⁹ Sandys, "A Sermon preached in York," 57-58.

prophets. Sandys's first sermon compares the Queen with Emperor Constantine, Samuel, Moses, Solomon, and David, "thus hath God blessed this vineyard his church with a learned, wise, religious, just, uncorrupt, mild, merciful, peaceful, and zealous prince to govern it."¹³⁰ By the same token, the sermons of John Prime, Thomas White (the prebendary of Mora in St. Paul's Cathedral) and Thomas Holland (the rector of Exeter College at Oxford University) link the Queen with King Solomon to praise her virtues of peace, plenty, and justice, and also stress their similitude of being "a foster-father a[nd] a nurcing mother vnto his Church," "the instrument a[nd] angel of God," and "the head a[nd] the eie of direction, for iustice, equity a[nd] good order in a commonwealth."¹³¹

Moreover, the sermons of Thomas White, John Prime, Isaac Colfe (the vicar of Brookland in Kent) and William Leigh (the rector of Standish in Lancashire) compare Elizabeth to King David. They draw people's attention to the dangers that Elizabeth had undergone as a princess and to her miraculous deliverance from her sister's hands, which are considered to have a strong resemblance to David's affliction before he took the crown. Prime's *The Consolations of Dauid* asks people to remember the day of "the happy 17, Day of Nouermber, 1558" which

God maketh it manifest to all the worlde, that himselfe was with her in all these tempests, and then, . . . a daughter of Dauid had as great Deliueraunces as euer Dauid had, and so her owne confession both then as since is a duefull and true confession. That neuer Prince, no neuer creature had euer greater.¹³²

¹³⁰ Ibid., 56, 58.

¹³¹ Prime, *A Sermon*, sig. B1v.

¹³² Prime, *The Consolations of Dauid*, sig. B2v.

Colfe, in his sermon preached in Kent in 1587, compares the ruler to the stone used to build “the head of the corner,” yet both David and Elizabeth were the stones once rejected by men and ultimately chosen by God, “those things which are reiected of the world, are most accepted of God, a[nd] that the things which are most vile and contemptible before men, are most pretious and glorious before God.” Colfe is deeply convinced that both David and Elizabeth are the beloved and “blessed of the Lord;” they came in the name of God and obtained the crown miraculously and lawfully by the power of the Lord.¹³³

The first of William Leigh’s three sermons, which were preached between 1601 and 1603 and printed in 1612, represents the Queen as King David in her religion, piety and godliness, and makes the parallel between their affliction and victory in maintaining the true religion. He celebrates their likeness zealously:

Dauid was the least and last of his fathers house, so was *Elizabeth* of her fathers familie, *Dauid* persecuted from his youth, so was *Elizabeth*: *Dauid* contemned of his brethren, *Elizabethan* of her sister; *Saul* a king persecuted *Dauid*, *Marie* a Queene was wroth with *Elizabeth*, *Dauid* an exile in the holdes of *Engeddi*, she close prisoner in holds of *Wodstocke*. *Doeg* reuiled *Dauid* vnto *Saul*, so did *Gardiner Elizabeth* vnto *Mary*. *Dauid* declared his innocencie vnto *Saul*, so did *Elizabeth* vnto her sister,¹³⁴

Subsequently, Leigh argues that both the victories of Elizabeth and David are the victory of weakness, as “*Dauid* killed *Goliah* in his weake strength, with prayer in his mouth, & a[nd] peeble stone in his hand, . . . *Queen Elizabeth* in her weake, and feminine sex, to giue God the glorie, hath subdued that great Giant at Gath, I meane

¹³³ Isaac Colfe, *A Sermon Preached on the Queenes Day, being the 17 of Nouember, 1587 at the twone of Lidd in Kent* (London: J. Wolfe, 1588, STC 5552), sig. A8v, D6r.

¹³⁴ Leigh, *Queen Elizabeth*, sig. D7v.

that man of Rome, with the sweete perfume of prayer in her mouth, and the power of the word of God in her blessed hand.” He therefore highly extols Elizabeth’s peaceable government as she is blessed of God.¹³⁵

The sermons of Thomas White and John King, the Queen’s chaplain, attach the image of King Josiah to Elizabeth to eulogise her achievement in restoring religion. King’s sermon in 1595 argues that the Queen should be represented by Josiah rather than other kings since Josiah was the perfect king in the catalogue of virtuous kings in the bible, “beyond the whole company which either went before or came after him.”¹³⁶ Furthermore, he claims that Elizabeth is even greater than Josiah, to be the perfect of the perfect. He points out Elizabeth’s superiority in three respects: first, “albeit Iosias began to raigne sooner, yet she hath longer continued,” King indicates that Josiah’s reign only lasted 31 years but Elizabeth had already accomplished 37 years; second, Elizabeth committed herself to uphold the true faith much earlier than Josiah; thirdly, the Queen consistently abides within the words of God and enjoys God’s grace, whereas King Josiah fell into the hands of the King of Egypt through his negligence of God’s words.¹³⁷

In addition, both Sandys and Leigh associate Elizabeth with Joshua, another biblical liberator, because they both delivered the Church from idolatry and corruption and brought a long-lasting repose to their people. The whole of Leigh’s second sermon is dedicated to the parallel between Joshua and Elizabeth, “to match

¹³⁵ Ibid., sig. E3v, E4r-v.

¹³⁶ John King, *A Sermon Preached in Yorke the Seventeenth Day of November in the yeare of our Lord 1595, being the Queenes day* (Oxford: Joseph Barnes, 1597, STC 14976), 686.

¹³⁷ Ibid., 699-700.

the power of Elizabeth, with the might of Iosua, her prowess, with his puissance, & maiden Queene, with a manly king.”¹³⁸ Other Scriptural male figures utilised to mirror Elizabeth’s virtues include Moses, Hezekiah and Augustus Caesar, the Roman Emperor. John King’s sermon even went beyond scriptural figures and compared Elizabethan England with Augustus’s Rome, for Elizabeth granted the English people an unprecedented sweet and fruitful peace just as Augustus had done to the Romans. He declares that

wee haue hitherto lived in peace, equall to that in the daies of Augustus, such, as our fathers never sawe the like, and when wee shall tell our childrens children to come thereof, they will not belieue it. Wee haue sitten at ease vnder the shadowe of our vines, vnder the shadowe of this vine haue wee shaded and solaced our selues, and lived by her sweetnes.¹³⁹

The eulogy of the Queen’s princely virtues actually culminated in Edwin Sandys’ second sermon. He not only compares the Queen with ancient Israelite kings and concludes that “Moses was not more mild, nor Samuel more just, nor David more faithful, nor Solomon more peaceful, nor Jehosaphat more ready to assist his neighbours, nor Ezekias more careful for God’s cause, nor Josias more zealous to restore sincere religion” than Elizabeth. But Sandys also compares the Queen further with her virtuous English predecessors and other contemporary European princes, stating:

neither was Henry the first better learned, nor Henry the second more easy to forgive and put up injuries, nor Edward the first more chaste, nor Edward the third more loth to accept of foreign dominion being offered, nor Edward the fourth more just in yielding all men their own, nor Henry the fifth more

¹³⁸ Leigh, *Queen Elizabeth*, sig. E6v.

¹³⁹ King, *A Sermon*, 702-03.

happy, nor Henry the sixth more holy, nor Henry the seventh more prudent, nor Henry the eighth more valiant in quelling the pope, nor Edward the sixth more sincerely affected towards the gospel of Christ. Look upon other princes at this day: some are drunken with the poisoned cup of that harlot [Catherine de Medici], whose venom her highness doth abhor; some have imbrued themselves in blood, wherewith her majesty did never yet stain the tip of her fingers.¹⁴⁰

This passage extols Elizabeth's virtue, piety and purity and demonstrates that she is not only comparable with all famous male kings, but is also even superior to them and therefore represents the perfect realisation of princely virtues.

Along with the discourse of the Queen's virtues, another significant theme in the sermons is the defence of the English church. The preachers of these sermons themselves were both supporters of and apologists for the Elizabethan established Church, in opposition to Catholics and radical Puritans (alternatively referred to as Presbyterians and nonconformists). The most vociferous apologist for the authority of the established Church among those preachers was John Whitgift. He resolutely opposed the radical Calvinist idea of church government and wrote a refutation in 1574 against Thomas Cartwright, the leader of Presbyterianism in England.¹⁴¹ Edwin Sandys was also in opposition to Thomas Cartwright and he was one of those who signed the order on 12 December 1573 for the arrest of Cartwright. Thomas Holland was elected as the rector of Exeter College, Oxford University, in 1592, under the influence of Queen Elizabeth. The reason for the Queen's support was

¹⁴⁰ Edwin Sandys, "A Sermon preached in the same place, and upon the same occasion with the former," in *The Sermons of Edwin Sandys*, 81.

¹⁴¹ For the Admonition Controversy in the 1570s see John Guy, "The Elizabethan Establishment and the Ecclesiastical Polity," in *The Reign of Elizabeth I: Court and Culture in the Last Decade*, ed. John Guy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 126-49.

that she relied on him to bring this college, where there were many Papists, into conformity with the established Church. In addition, John Howson and John King were also the loyal servants of the Crown and were chosen to be the Queen's chaplains in 1598 and 1599 respectively.¹⁴²

For these preachers, the defence of the Queen's virtues and authority was tantamount to the sanctity of the English Church. Amongst all the Queen's virtues, her religious virtue, namely her maintenance of the true religion, her purging of idolatry and superstition, and her purifying of the rituals, was undoubtedly her most celebrated achievement, for these preachers. Elizabeth's association with the biblical kings also largely resulted from her similar (or even greater) contribution to the Protestant Church. Sandys's first sermon particularly emphasises Elizabeth's constancy in true faith as "a prince so zealous for God's house, so firmly settled in his truth, that she hath constantly determined, and oftentimes vowed, rather to suffer all torments, than one jot to relent in matter of religion."¹⁴³

Additionally, several sermons represent the Queen as "God's royal handmaid," "the chosen handmaid," or "the bride of Christ," meaning to illustrate Elizabeth's religious commitment. This sort of representation of the Queen seems to suggest that the Protestant preachers also involve themselves in associating the Queen with the Virgin Mary, because the imagery of the bride of Christ is an important ingredient in the symbolism of the Virgin Mary. However, the term was in fact also

¹⁴² See *Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. 17, 772-75; vol. 9, 1052-53; vol. 10, 129-30; vol. 11, 136-38.

¹⁴³ Sandys, "A Sermon preached in York," 58.

conventionally utilised to eulogise virgins, female saints and nuns. Furthermore, the position of these preachers made it impossible to suggest that the sermons shared the resurgent cult of the Virgin Mary, because they generally supported Elizabeth's abolition of this Catholic cult of idols, as William Leigh celebrated her purging of the old cult, "whereunto England burned incense to the Queene of heaven [the Virgin Mary] till Elizabeth came."¹⁴⁴ Therefore, the utilising of these terms means more, as Helen Hackett suggests, in sustaining "the identification of the bride with the Church," and thus to identify the Queen with the Church.¹⁴⁵

More significantly, the sermons' identification of the Queen with the English Church aims to strengthen the English people's national and religious identities, as opposed to the intervention from Rome. This project is executed in two ways: firstly to reproach the mischief of the papists and deny the Pope's authority; secondly to demand people's obedience to the Queen, in order to reach religious and political uniformity. Sandys compares the papists to foxes in their greed, cruelty, and wiliness, "spiritual and corporal whoredom of the most part go together."¹⁴⁶ He not only reminds the audience of Catholic wicked tricks intended to destroy the beautiful vineyard—the English Church—but also advocates the imposition of more severe restraints on Catholic religious activities and even persecution in order to dispatch this idolatry speedily, for "God commandeth false prophets not only to be taken, but also to die the death."¹⁴⁷ Sandys declares the Catholic Church to be a falsification

¹⁴⁴ Leigh, *Queen Elizabeth*, sig. K6r-v.

¹⁴⁵ Hackett, *Virgin Mother, Maiden Queen*, 55.

¹⁴⁶ Sandys, *A Sermon preached in York*, 63-64, 65.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 69, and see 72.

of the true religion—"they should remember that their religion is as new as false; six hundred years after Christ unknown"—, but the Protestant Church to be perpetual, claiming that "the substance of our religion is most ancient, and shall be most permanent; it was from the beginning; it shall remain to the end; no jot nor tittle thereof shall perish."¹⁴⁸

The criticisms of William Leigh, John King and John Whitgift towards Catholicism focus on the Pope's usurpation and the Queen's authority over the Church. Leigh condemns the Pope who "authorise subiects to depriue their Princes, as if the powers that be, were not ordained of God."¹⁴⁹ Whitgift also scolds "the Bishop of Rome" who "vsurpe vnto themselues power, to place and displace Emperors and Kings at their pleasure, to deliuer thier subiectes from their oath of obedience."¹⁵⁰ They all proclaim that popes are inferior to kings according to the Apostolic doctrine, and kings hold lawful authority over ecclesiastical affairs as "all the good Kings and Magistrates of the Old Testament, as Iosua, Daud, Salomon, Asa, Iosaphat, Ezechias, Iosias, &c. had and veyed this authority."¹⁵¹ Since the sermons have represented Elizabeth as these Old Testament kings, it is certain for them that the Queen wields the same authority over the Church. Ultimately, these preachers deliberately stir a national sentiment, appealing to the people to love and obey their prince, to protect the Queen and the Church, because there is an imminent

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., 66.

¹⁴⁹ Leigh, *Queen Elizabeth*, sig. Bsv.

¹⁵⁰ John Whitgift, *A Most Godly and Learned Sermon, preached at Pauls Crosse the 17 of Nouember, in the yeare of our Lorde 1583* (London: Thomas Orwin, 1589, STC 25432), sig. Csr.

¹⁵¹ Ibid., sig. C3r.

danger emerging from outside, an united force led by the Pope against the Queen and England.¹⁵²

Taken as a whole, the sermons transparently promoted a cult of Elizabeth, portraying her as an ideal ruler who embodied the princely virtues and particularly upheld the Church of God. Elizabeth's capacity to rule was therefore justified by her various masculine virtues, such as piety, peace, honesty, mercy, justice, wisdom and constancy. Furthermore, Elizabeth's rule was elaborated as the triumph of true religion, blessed perpetually with God's grace, as the most godly government ever experienced by the English people. It is significant that the sermons exhibited a different pattern of glorification of the Queen from other panegyric and represented Elizabeth's virtues predominantly through male figures. In addition, their approach to demonstrating the Queen's virtues reflected Elizabeth's own fashioning of her virtues to a larger extent than most of other panegyric. Or put in another way, they clearly corresponded to Elizabeth's concern for the cultivation of princely virtues in the second half of her reign. Their resemblance to the Queen's self-fashioning had two aspects. First, the princely virtues which the sermons had suggested, such as justice, piety and peace, were very similar to the Queen's own cultivation. Second, they followed the style of the Queen in intermingling female qualities in the main discourse of valiant princely qualities to hail Elizabeth as a virtuous woman as well as a great man, as Edwin Sandys represents the Queen as "the spouse of Christ," as

¹⁵² Leigh, *Queen Elizabeth*, sig. E2r.

well as “Christ himself.”¹⁵³ They commonly cited the verse in Isaiah 49.23: “And Kings shalbe thy nourcing fathers, and Quenes shalbe thy nources,” which exhorted and extolled Elizabeth to be both father and mother, king and queen, to look after subjects’ welfare and cherish the church. By the same token, they, like Elizabeth herself, acknowledged that the Queen had a feeble body as a maiden virgin, “vnmeete: vnarmed, and therefore vnfit to resist.”¹⁵⁴ Nevertheless, they claimed that Elizabeth was specially ordained by God and equipped with the masculine prowess and puissance, both of which distinguished the Queen from other women, including Mary Tudor.

In conclusion, this chapter, contrary to the majority of studies of Elizabeth’s representations, has focused on her cultivation of virtues through her own voice, and on the representations of her princely virtues through godly male figures. While confronting the same obstacles to female rule as her sister, Elizabeth appeared to have learned precious lessons from Queen Mary, whose excessive concentration on female qualities and lack of masculine rulers’ virtues provided a mirror of failure to Elizabeth. Elizabeth consequently consciously managed an image combining both masculinity and femininity to style her political power. Although Elizabeth’s representation of her womanly virtues borrowed many old symbols of ideal femininity from the reign of Mary, she was inventive in manufacturing double gender

¹⁵³ Sandys, *A Sermon preached in York*, 69.

¹⁵⁴ Colfe, *A Sermon*, sig. Bsr.

identities: both a virgin and man, a queen and king, a mother and father. In particular, Elizabeth's art of rhetoric, distinguished herself from Mary and other ruling queens, effectively transformed the presumed abnormality of female rule into a source of political strength. More significantly, in the latter half of her reign, she also demonstrated a strong sense of developing her princely virtues—the classical essence of rulers' heroic qualities—to reinforce her rule. Both in her public speeches and her letters to King James, Elizabeth cultivated an image elaborately that she was the embodiment of princely virtues and a mentor of the art of statecraft, guiding other less mature contemporary rulers. Both her art of rhetoric and a sense of princely virtues derived from her early humanist training, directed by Roger Ascham. However, as discussed in the second and third sections, Elizabeth also absorbed some of the strategies of fashioning presented by two famous Italian authors of “mirror-for-princes,” Castiglione and Machiavelli. In addition, her actions displayed a cunning use of language and a sort of dissimulation which were congenial to these two writers' political pragmatism.

This chapter has argued that Elizabeth's concern with and her cultivation of princely virtues was more reflected by the sermons preached for the annual celebrations of the Queen's Accession Day, from 1579 to 1603, than in other Elizabethan panegyric. In the sermons, the Queen was not represented as the second Virgin Mary as other forms of eulogies. Instead, associating Elizabeth with the biblical kings and prophets and preceding English male rulers appeared to be the principal means of mirroring the Queen's virtue and authority. This manifested that

the cult of Elizabeth indeed had two forms of representations after 1579: one by the image of the Virgin, the other by the association with male personae. Crucially, the sermons verbally and directly addressed a larger audience than the courtly entertainments and their printings could remain circulating farther among the English people. Therefore they were of greater value as propaganda, being able to penetrate people's perception of the Queen as an ideal ruler, comparable or even superior to all the virtuous male rulers in the past. Furthermore, these sermons not only represented the Queen as providential champion of the true faith and the rescuer of the English people from Catholic idolatry, but also attached the Queen to the State and the Church in order to stimulate fervent allegiance to the Queen.



Figure 6. Elizabeth I as Emperor Constantine, from John Foxe, *Actes and Monuments* (1563).

Regni Angloisraelitici typus.

Figure 7. Elizabeth I as King Solomon, from Thomas Morton, *Salomon or a Treatise Declaring the State of the Kingdome of Israel* (1596).

Part Two

The Legitimacy of the Queen's Rule

“For God is not contrarie to him self, whiche at the begynninge appoynted the woman to be in subiection to her husbande, and the man to be head of the woman Yf women be not permitted by Ciuile policies to rule in inferior offices, to be Counsellours, Pears of a realme, Iustices, Shireffs, Bay liues and such like: I make your selues iudges, whither it be mete for them to gouerne whole Realmes and nations?”

Christopher Goodman, *How Superior Powers ought to be Obeyd* (1558), sig. D2v.

Chapter 3

Mary's Rule and Obedience to the Female Monarchy

On 6 July 1553, King Henry VIII's sole son, Edward VI, died and suddenly England had to face the fact that all the claimants to the crown were women. The English people were subsequently ruled by two female monarchs, Mary I and Elizabeth I, for a full fifty years in the latter half of the sixteenth century. Significantly, Mary Tudor, King Henry's first daughter, became the first queen regnant in the history of England since the Conquest.¹ However, women in this period were perceived as the "weaker vessel," as traditional patriarchal authority of the Scriptures and Aristotle presumed, subordinated to men in the social hierarchy.² Women were generally kept away from public participation, from playing the roles of magistrates, governors or monarchs. Moreover, sixteenth-century society conventionally did not permit woman to wield any authority over man in theology or religious opinions, in accordance with St. Paul's teachings about women keeping silent in church, much less allow women to have supremacy in the political arena. Although there were some noblewomen who successfully entered the political world

¹ Before the accession of Mary in 1553, there were two precedents for woman's rule in English history. One is Maud or Matilda (1127-1135), daughter of Henry I. The other is Lady Jane Grey (1553), the nine-day Queen. But both of them do not seem to have been considered true queen regnants. Historians usually view Mary I as the first English ruling queen. For the life of Mary I, see H. F. M. Prescott, *Mary Tudor* (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1952); D. M. Loades, *Mary Tudor: A Life* (Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1989) and Rosalind K. Marshall, *Mary I* (London: HMSO, published in association with the National Portrait Gallery, 1993).

² See Constance Jordan, *Renaissance Feminism: Literary Texts and Political Models* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990), 21-34.

through the patronage and the network of kinship in sixteenth-century Europe, it still seemed anomalous and unsuitable for a man to observe a woman's arbitration in religious and political affairs.

The issue of the queen's rule had provoked tremendous controversy in political and intellectual arenas since the reign of Henry VIII. During his reign, the thought of having no male heir for succession had considerably influenced the course of Tudor monarchy. William Shakespeare vividly presents King Henry's lamenting, "her [Catherine] male issue or died where they were made, or shortly after this world had air'd them. Hence I took a thought this was a judgment on me, that my kingdom (well worthy the best heir o'th'world) should not be gladdened in't by me."³ King Henry consequently sought the annulment of his marriage with Catherine of Aragon in the late 1520s. He himself once disclaimed that "although it hath pleased Almighty God to send us a fair daughter of a noble woman, and of me begotten, . . . yet it hath been told us, by divers great clerks, that neither she is our lawful daughter, nor her mother our lawful wife, but that we live together abominably and detestably in open adultery."⁴ After a long wrestle with the Pope, Henry finally expelled the authority of Rome from England and Mary was officially claimed a bastard from an unlawful matrimony in 1534.⁵ Henry's divorce further manifested the preference of a male ruler and greatly diminished Mary's legitimacy to the English throne.

³ William Shakespeare, *King Henry VIII*, ed. R. A. Foakes (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd, the Arden Shakespeare, 1968), II-4, 86.

⁴ Henry's oration to his subjects on 8 November 1529, printed in Foxe, V, 48.

⁵ See XXV, Henry VIII, cap. 22, *Statutes of the Realm*, III, 471-75. For the trial of Henry's divorce, see H. A. Kelley, *The Matrimonial Trial of Henry VIII* (California: Stanford University Press, 1976).

Given the obstacles of traditional constructions of gender and Mary's illegitimacy, this chapter will first examine to what extent, practically and theoretically, Mary and her supporters were able to establish the legitimacy of Mary's sovereignty. Historians usually have more negative perceptions of Mary than of Elizabeth. On the one hand, they view Mary as a fragile and feeble woman, meddling with political affairs. Even if she was not as effective a politician as Elizabeth Tudor, nevertheless, we must not underestimate her strong-willed vigour in seeking her own right of succession, no matter how traditional or conservative her own conception of the female sex may have been. On the other hand, with regard to the accommodation of English female monarchy, historians usually treat Queen Elizabeth as the initiator and model. However, as Judith M. Richards recently points out, it was during the reign of Mary that several novel constitutional propositions were introduced to the monarchy which shed the first light on people's comprehension of queenship.⁶ Those Marian devices significantly underlay the framework of Elizabeth's rule. In addition, all the controversial issues of queenship which Mary had confronted also challenged Elizabeth's rule. Therefore, we may argue that, Elizabeth reaped the fruit of Marian efforts in instituting the legitimacy of queenship, while had continually to face up to other issues that had remained unresolved in Mary's reign.

⁶ Judith M. Richards, "Mary Tudor as 'Sole Quene'?: Gendering Tudor Monarchy," *Historical Journal* 40-4 (1997): 895-924.

Secondly, this chapter will focus on two “mirror-for-queens” texts among the group of those who supported Mary's rule. One is John Christopherson's *An Exhortation to All Menne to Take Hede and Beware of Rebellion* (1554) and the other is James Cancellar's *The Path of Obedience* (1556?).⁷ Both tracts have been mentioned in Chapter 1 in regard to their eulogising of Mary's godliness. They are also important in upholding Mary's sovereignty, refurbishing the Tudor idea of political obedience to secular rulers. However, neither of the works has been seriously examined by historians for understanding the construction of Mary's queenship. Modern scholars of women's history have already paid much attention to the polemical pamphlets written by Protestant exiles to renounce the legitimacy of the woman's rule.⁸ But most of those studies lack a comparison between the defence of Mary's sovereignty from the Catholic apologists and the detraction from Protestant exiles. In fact, both the Catholic and Protestant works primarily touched on the theme of political obedience to temporal rulers. Therefore, this chapter will not merely recount the Protestant idea of disobedience, but also examine the contrast

⁷ John Christopherson, *An Exhortation to All Menne to Take Hede and Beware of Rebellion* (London: J. Cawood, 1554, STC 5207); James Cancellar, *The Path of Obedience, righte necessarye for all the king and quenes maiesties louing subiectes* (London: J. Waylande, 1556? STC 4564).

⁸ There are numerous works concerning the Protestant debate on queenship, such as Paula Louise Scalingi, “The Scepter or the Distaff: The Question of Female Sovereignty, 1516-1607,” *The Historian* 41-1 (1978): 59-75; Retha M. Warnicke, “Queens Regnant and the Royal Supremacy, 1525-1587,” in *Women of the English Renaissance and Reformation* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1983), 47-66; Carole Levin, “Queens and Claimants: Political Insecurity in Sixteenth-Century England,” in *Gender, Ideology and Action: Historical Perspectives on Women's Public Lives*, ed. Janet Sharistanian (New York, 1986); Constance Jordan, “Woman's Rule in Sixteenth-Century British Political Thought,” *Renaissance Quarterly*, 40 (1987): 421-51; Patricia-Ann Lee, “A Bodye Politique to Governe: Aylmer, Knox and the Debate on Queenship,” *The Historian*, 52 (1990): 242-61; and Judith M. Richards, “‘To Promote a Woman to Beare Rule’: Talking of Queens in Mid-Tudor England,” *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 28-1(1997): 101-21.

between the attempts of Mary and the Catholics to legitimise the Queen's rule, and the Marian exiles' discourse against those attempts.

I. The Queen's legitimacy

Although Mary was bastardised and excluded from the line of succession in 1534 after her father married Anne Boleyn, in the year of 1544 there came an opportunity for her to be restored to her appropriate place in the succession. The circumstances of King Henry's problem of succession had changed in that year, for his marriages with Anne of Cleves and Catherine Howard had been childless and the new Queen Katherine Parr was not pregnant, and even his sole male heir Prince Edward was in bad health. Moreover, Henry was preparing to sail out to invade France by early 1544 and therefore it became necessary for him and Parliament to designate a new order of succession in case he died in the battlefield or the Prince's life ended before his turning back.⁹ Thus Parliament ratified Henry's Third Act of Succession, which confirmed Mary's as well as Elizabeth's right of succession, but surprisingly without restoring their legitimacy, as it declared:

. . . that in case it shall happen the Kinges Majestie and . . . Prince Edward
. . . to decease without heire of either of their bodies lawfullye begotten . . .
That then the . . . Imperiall Crowne and all the other premises shall be to the
Ladye Marie the Kinges Highnes Daughter and to the heires of the bodye of
the same Ladye Mary lawfullie begotten. . . and for defaulte of suche issue
the saide Imperiall Crowne and other the premises shalbe to the Ladye

⁹ Mortimer Levine, *Tudor Dynastic Problems, 1460-1571* (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1973), 71-72.

Elizabeth the Kinges seconde daughter and to the heires of the bodie of the saide Lady Elizabeth lawfullye begotten. . . .¹⁰

Henry reaffirmed the order of succession in his will dated 30 December 1546. However, after Edward succeeded to the throne in 1547, he and the Duke of Northumberland attempted to remove Mary from the succession line and ultimately succeeded with Edward VI's Letter Patent for the Limitation of the Crown in 1553. It was grounded in King Henry's will which had the regulation that if Mary and Elizabeth married without the consent of Edward's Regent-Council, both of them would lose their claim to the throne. It therefore brought a charge that should the Princess marry "with any stranger" who was "born out of this realm," the husband would subvert the laws of England. It declared that the English crown should descend to Lady Jane Grey, who had married a native Englishman, Guildford Dudley, the heir of the Duke of Northumberland.¹¹ Subsequently, Lady Jane was proclaimed Queen of England on 10 July 1553.¹²

The presumed marriage of Mary to a foreigner was only an ostensible reason to rule her out of inheritance. For Edward and the Protestant minority around him, the fears that Mary would alter the religion and bring back the authority of the Pope was a more crucial reason to forestall her succession. Such fears plainly showed in the sermon of Dr. Ridley, Bishop of London, on 9 July 1553. He indicated Mary as a

¹⁰ XXXV, Henry VIII, cap. 1, *Statutes of the Realm*, III, 955.

¹¹ See the "documents" no. 22, 23, 25 in Levine, *Tudor Dynastic Problems*.

¹² *Queen Jane and Queen Mary*, 3.

“stiff Papist,” and if she were queen she would overturn all the religion “so happily established under King Edward” and betray the kingdom to a “foreign power.”¹³

Mary decided not to yield to the innovation in Edward's will nor respond to any charges pronounced by her opponents. Instead, she vigorously asserted her own right and title, immediately proclaiming herself queen in her household at Kenninghall, on 9 July when King Edward's death was confirmed.¹⁴ She at once wrote to the Council in London, proclaiming her right to the throne provided by “act of parliament and the testament and last will of our dearest father.” Again, she wrote in a tone of warning, exhorting the Council to avoid “bloodshed and vengeance,” and threatening with an uprising if the situation forced her to “use the service of others our true subjects and friends, which in this our just and right cause, God . . . shall send us.”¹⁵ Nevertheless, the Council asked for her silence and obedience in return and assuredly reminded her that the divorce between King Henry and “lady Katherine” had made her illegitimate and nullified her inheritance to the crown.¹⁶ In addition to her letter to the Council, Mary also sent one to Sir Edward Hastings, commanding him to support her in Middlesex and Buckinghamshire. Similarly, she alleged her right again in this letter that the crown “is justly come unto us by God's providence; as appears by such provisions as have been made by act of

¹³ See John Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials, relating chiefly to religion and the reformation of it, and the emergencies of the church of England, under King Henry VIII, King Edward VI and Queen Mary I*, III, i (Oxford, 1822), 6.

¹⁴ Loades, *Mary Tudor*, 176. Loades points out that Mary might have already decided her course of action at least several days earlier and consulted only some her normal household officers.

¹⁵ Mary's letter to the Council is printed in Foxe, VI, 385.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 386.

Parliament, and the testament and last will of our late dearest father King Henry VIII.”¹⁷

Mary viewed her own right as being supported by divine and human law, and correspondingly, she gained a rapid and widespread support towards her claim. Her support derived mainly from East Anglia as she moved to Framlingham castle in Suffolk on 12 July, and also in the Thames Valley.¹⁸ On 14 July, the Duke of Northumberland had raised an army of 3000 men to put down Mary's uprising. However, his force dwindled as he moved towards Mary's growing army; D. M. Loades suggests that “the stronger the rumours of Mary's power became . . . the more openly every man, from citizens of London to his former allies on the council, began to distance themselves from him [Northumberland] and his protégée.”¹⁹ Eventually, Mary was proclaimed Queen of England by the councillors in London behind Northumberland's back on 19 July.²⁰

It is noteworthy, in the overall course of the succession crisis in July 1553, that gender was not a critical issue for both sides since all of the individuals in the order of succession were women, and Mary actually took over the throne of another woman, Lady Jane Grey. Apart from Mary's inflexible commitment to Catholicism, the two most polemical issues were rather her legitimacy and potential threat of a foreign marriage; the former resulted from the fact that King Henry's

¹⁷ Mary's letter to Hastings is printed in Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, III. ii. 1.

¹⁸ Loades, *Mary Tudor*, 177; Jennifer Loach, *Parliament and the Crown in the Reign of Mary Tudor* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), 4.

¹⁹ Loades, *Mary Tudor*, 180.

²⁰ The ambassadors to the Emperor, 19 July 1553, *CSP Sp.*, XI, 96.

Third Act of Succession and his will had granted Mary's right of succession without repealing her bastardy. Mary's policy was not to respond to the latter, never touching on the issue of marriage in any of her letters or proclamations, nor ever declaring that she would not marry a foreigner. Instead, she persistently alleged her legitimacy to succeed to the English throne as if that was her single weapon to fight the dislocation of succession.

Mary had had a sturdy determination in her own legitimacy as the only rightful heir to Henry VIII since she was the Princess. By the end of September 1533, when Henry's commissioners came to Mary and announced that she was deprived of the title of the Princess of Wales, she intractably protested that

my conscience will in no wise suffer me to take any other than myself for the king's lawful daughter, born in true matrimony, or princess; and that I will never willingly . . . agree to the contrary.²¹

She deferred to the Pope as the judge in the matter of divorce and stoutly refuted her new status as a bastard. She even boldly wrote to her father,

. . . I doubt not in your goodness, but your grace doth take me for your lawful daughter, born in true matrimony. Wherefore, if I should agree to the contrary, I should in my conscience run in the displeasure of God, And in all other things your grace shall have me always as humble and obedient a daughter and handmaid as ever was child to the father.²²

Like her mother, Catherine of Aragon, Mary refused to relinquish the title and contended that she was "born in true matrimony." Her faith in her own claim had become a principle of her existence, to which she had obstinately held her legitimacy

²¹ "Mary's letter to the protestation to certain lords sent by her father," Foxe, VI, 353.

²² On 2 October 1533, Foxe, VI, 353.

since her youth. Apparently, there was no other sensible consideration more powerful for Mary than the cause of legitimacy in her route to seek the crown. Very similar to her grandmother, Isabella of Castile, she was a woman who vigorously and wilfully fought for her own right to succeed to the throne. Without substantial help from Charles V, the Emperor, her cousin and strongest supporter, Mary's decisiveness and sturdiness were remarkable in the eyes of contemporaries.²³ It was a vigour incompatible with her traditional and humanist upbringing, but one that emanated from her personal insistence upon the integrity of her family, particularly of her mother.

Nevertheless, we may ask whether Mary's rapid triumph reflected that her appeal of legitimacy supported by the laws and will of King Henry effectively gathered people to stand at her side. With hindsight, John Foxe in his *Acts and Monuments* suggests that Mary's claim was primarily strengthened by gospellers in Suffolk, where the Duke of Northumberland was hated for "the service that had been done there of late under king Edward," so they exchanged their aid in return for Mary's promise not to alter the religion.²⁴ Later, John Strype, in his *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, follows Foxe's idea that Mary's cause was advanced by the help of gospellers because she represented King Henry's will.²⁵ Likewise, D. M. Loades

²³ More see Loades, *Mary Tudor*, 178-83; E. Harris Harbison, *Rival Ambassadors at the Court of Queen Mary* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1940), 53-56.

²⁴ Foxe, VI, 387.

²⁵ John Strype wrote that "for though the people of Suffolk and Norfolk were generally professors and favourers of the Gospel; yet the consideration that she was established by the King her father and Parliament, to be successor to her brother, and heir to the crown after him." So they vigorously assisted her with their lives. See his *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, III. i. 16-17.

also suggests that, although people's hatred of the Duke was an important reason to dissociate the people from him, the righteousness of Mary's succession moved people to assemble round her more readily.²⁶

Indeed the vast majority of people saw Mary as the legitimate successor. However, according to Jennifer Loach's innovative research on the composition of Mary's active supporters, her success fundamentally depended on Catholics' loyalty to her. Loach points out that "it was the catholic gentry of East Anglia and the Thames Valley who actively supported Mary; Protestants, whatever their doubts about Northumberland's behaviour or their convictions about the validity of her title, did not spontaneously join her."²⁷ That is to say, people did not share the same view of the significance of Mary's claim to legitimacy as she herself, nor did they perceive the succession crisis merely in terms of legitimacy, but more in terms of religion. Mary might also have understood the religious element in her support, yet the rapidity of her success moved her to consider it more as divine affirmation of her legitimacy, a faith she had held since her youth.

Mary indeed considered her legitimacy as the first and foremost ingredient of her political power. Her view could explain why one of her primary concerns in her first Parliament, started on 5 October 1553, was to pass a bill validating the marriage between Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon. In September 1553, Mary had urged the ambassadors of Charles V, the Emperor, to send a speedy dispatch to obtain

²⁶ Loades, *Mary Tudor*, 183. For people's dislike of the Duke Northumberland's scheme in the succession order and his conspiracy co-operating with France, see Harbison, *Rival Ambassadors*, 33-36.

²⁷ Loach, *Parliament and the Crown*, 7-8.

evidence as soon as possible, in order to find among the Emperor's papers a copy of the sentence pronounced by the consistory at Rome in favour of her parents' marriage and against the divorce. The Emperor's ambassadors indicated that Mary viewed it as a necessary measure, "for otherwise the accusation of bastardy which has been brought against the Queen would always be coming up for discussion and would not be effaced from the people's mind."²⁸ The bill about her parents' marriage finally passed in October, which subsequently became law, formally declaring that Mary was born in a "most just and lawfull matrimonie." All the previous acts of Parliament declaring Mary a bastard or the marriage unlawful were thus repealed.²⁹

Mary's anxiety over her own legitimacy might also explain the promptness of her religious restoration. Although there is only slight evidence for this conclusion, one of Cardinal Pole's letters gives us some clue. In his letter to the Emperor's confessor, written in October 1553 before he came to England, Pole indicated that Mary's restitution of obedience to Rome was not only propelled by "the rewards of a future life," but also by the practical interests of this present world, "failing the support of the Holy See, she would not be legitimate heir to the crown, for the marriage of her mother was not valid but by a dispensation of his Holiness." Therefore, displaying allegiance to the Pope is greatly necessary for Mary to secure her power, "since upon it depends her very claim to the crown."³⁰

²⁸ The Ambassadors in England to the Emperor, 30 September 1553, *CSP Sp.*, XI, 260.

²⁹ I Mary st.2, cap.1; *Statutes of the Realm*, IV, ii, 200-01.

³⁰ Instructions by Cardinal Pole to the Reverend Father Confessor of the Emperor, October 1553, *CSP For.*, 20-21.

Mary delivered an even clearer message regarding the legality of her queenship during Wyatt's rebellion of 1554,³¹ in her oration in Guildhall in February,

I am the right and true inheritor of the crown of this realm of England, I take all Christendom to witness. My father, as ye all know, possessed the same regal state, which now rightly is descended unto me: and to him always ye showed yourselves most faithful and loving subjects; and therefore I doubt not, but ye will show yourselves [such] likewise to me³²

By these words, she construed her right of succession as directly descending from her father Henry VIII. Furthermore, regarding her status as queen, she was convinced that since her legitimacy undoubtedly was validated, the legality of her queenship was therefore confirmed; people hence absolutely had to yield their obedience to her as to any kings, both religiously and politically.

II. The paradigm of joint rule

The legality of Mary's sovereignty had been confirmed by the clarification of her legitimacy. However, another crisis for Mary's rule soon cropped up when she decided to marry Philip, the Prince of Spain. It had already been said during the reign of King Edward that should Mary come to the throne, she would marry a foreigner and therefore subject the country to alien rule.³³ Moreover, people generally knew that Mary depended considerably upon the Emperor's support and

³¹ About Wyatt's rebellion see D. M. Loades, *Two Tudor Conspiracies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), 47-88; Anthony Fletcher and Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Tudor Rebellions* (London: Longman, 1997), 81-93.

³² The Oration of Queen Mary in Guildhall dated on 1 February 1554, printed in Foxe, VI, 414.

³³ One of such thought see Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, III. i. 206.

had deferred to his influence since her youth. Therefore, popular fears that England would be overrun by Spaniards rose strongly when marriage negotiations with Spain formally started in December 1553.³⁴

During the controversy over the Queen's marriage, Thomas Smith asked a shrewd question which clearly pointed out the conflict between the queen's power and her husband's:

In case, said he, that bands should be broken between the husband and the wife, either of them being princes in their own country, who shall sue the bands? who shall take the forfeits? Who shall be their judges? and what shall be the advantage?³⁵

Furthermore, some in opposition to this match also tried to persuade the Queen to summon a parliament in order to thwart the Spanish alliance. Simon Renard reported that the pretext had been furnished by two English lawyers who stated that if the Prince of Spain married the Queen, "she loses her title to the Crown and his Highness becomes King, so that if children are born to the couple, the eldest will not be King, but his Highness will continue in that position."³⁶

The controversy of Mary's marriage demonstrated the uncertainty over the effect on a female monarch if she married: would she have to submit herself as well as her property —the realm— to her husband? The marriage negotiations with Spain also gave rise to the speculation on the political relationship between a queen regnant and her husband. Indeed, the legal status of a queen regnant was still ambiguous and

³⁴ For the marriage negotiation see D. M. Loades, "The Spanish Marriage," in *The Reign of Mary Tudor: Politics, Government and Religion in England, 1553-1558* (London: Ernest Benn, 1979), 109-47.

³⁵ Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, III. i. 85-86.

³⁶ Simon Renard to the Bishop of Arras, 7 January 1554, *CSP Sp.*, XII, 15.

problematic in mid-sixteenth-century England because it lacked law and precedents. The marriage negotiation with Spain provided such a chance for England to clarify the queen's regal authority, and largely exhibited it in the marriage treaty of Mary and Philip which was formally proclaimed on 14 January 1554.³⁷ The treaty actually was a result of co-operation and compromise between supporters and those opposed to this marriage, particularly Stephen Gardiner, the Lord Chancellor, Bishop of Winchester.³⁸ On the one hand, it implicitly showed the fears of Spanish hegemony, and on the other hand, overwhelmingly expressed the protection of English interests.

The marriage treaty granted Philip the title of king and allowed him "to have and enjoy jointly together with the same most noble Queen his wife the style, honor, and kingly name of the realms . . . and shall aid the same most noble Queen his wife in the prosperous administration of her realms and dominions"³⁹ Nevertheless, the marriage articles appeared tremendously strong in support of English and female supremacy. First, it declared that Mary, as the head of the realm, should wield the same sovereign power before or after she married. Although Philip received the title of King, nonetheless, "in this marriage to take upon him rather as a subject than otherwise."⁴⁰ Mary held the whole disposition of all the benefits, offices, lands,

³⁷ The terms of the treaty see *Queen Jane and Queen Mary*, 35; and *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, II, 21-26.

³⁸ Gardiner worked for the safeguard of English freedom and independence in the marriage treaty see Glyn Redworth, *In Defence of the Church Catholic: the Life of Stephen Gardiner* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990), 309-10; and James A. Muller, *Stephen Gardiner and Tudor Reaction* (London: S.P.C.K., 1926), 242-43.

³⁹ *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, II, 21.

⁴⁰ *Queen Jane and Queen Mary*, 35.

revenues and so on, but Philip had no right to subvert English laws and customs or to promote any person born out of the country. Second, there were a number of restrictions on Spanish intervention in English affairs. There should be no Spaniards in the Queen's council and household, nor should they have the custody of any forts or castles or bear any office in all England. Third, the succession to the English throne was grounded in "the right of the mother's inheritance in the realm of England, . . . the males and females both that shall be born of this matrimony shall succeed in them" This term impeded any possibility that the English crown would fall into the hands of Don Carlos, Philip's existing heir, or any other aliens. Other stipulations included those that Philip was not allowed to take the Queen or their children out of her realm, nor should he remove jewels or precious artefacts from England. Moreover, England must not be drawn into the wars which the Emperor and Philip waged with other countries.⁴¹

As a whole, the marriage treaty to a great degree defined the relationship between the ruling queen and her consort upon the model of the joint rule of Isabella of Castile and Ferdinand of Aragon in Spain. Isabella of Castile, "the first Renaissance Queen," as historians usually term her, initiated and successfully accomplished the institution of joint rule with her husband Ferdinand. Moreover, their paradigm of joint rule was not the last. The rule of Juana of Castile (known as Juana the Mad), Isabella's daughter, with her husband Philip the Fair (1504-06), her rule with her father Ferdinand after the death of her husband (1506-16), and

⁴¹ *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, II, 22-23, 25-26.

afterwards with her son Charles V (1516-1555), all followed the pattern of joint rule, although she had never exercised real power.⁴²

Mary and her councillors, consciously or not, also turned to this Spanish precedent for guidance and largely followed the Castilian paradigm of joint rule. Actually, Mary's marriage itself had not only resurrected the earlier Anglo-Spanish alliance realised by Catherine of Aragon, but also recalled people's remembrance of the glorious legacy of Isabella's rule. Some people believed that Mary's marriage would achieve the same "great commodity and benefit to all Christendom" as "the marriage of their progenitors Ferdinand and Isabella."⁴³ Moreover, in the parliament of April 1554, which aimed to ratify the marriage treaty, the analogy to the pattern of Isabella's rule came to the fore, when members discussed the King's and Queen's signatures in all documents. Some lawyers mentioned the norm of Queen Isabella's rule and made answer that "the Lady Isabella of Aragon, of good memory, sign[ed] alone after she married."⁴⁴

For a ruling queen, joint rule was a good means to fulfil both her private and public duties. Particularly in a period when most people perceived the business of governing as being out of women's capacity, joint rule could be an expedient for a queen regnant to solve the perceived fragility of female rule, enhancing its acceptability. As Isabella's own marriage had displayed, she had not only gained military support for her claim to the throne by marrying the Prince of Aragon, but she

⁴² Felipe Fernández-Armesto, *Ferdinand and Isabella* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1975), 83-84.

⁴³ Dr. Wotton to King Philip and Queen Mary, 10 August 1554, *CSP For.*, 112-13.

⁴⁴ Simon Renard to the Emperor, 3 April 1554, *CSP Sp.*, XII, p.202.

was also able to pursue religious wars against the Moors. By the same token, Mary supposed that by this marriage she could gain the support of Spain to restore the Catholic faith and, moreover, to share the burden of political affairs with her husband. Although she did not declare it openly, joint rule—a paradigm from her maternal progenitors—was the most likely form of government for her to pursue. Perhaps she and her councillors believed that people would accept this pattern as the Spaniards had done before.⁴⁵

Mary's marriage treaty itself also had much similarity to Isabella's *capitulaciounes*, announced on 7 January 1469. According to the latter, Isabella alone was the "rightful heir to these kingdoms of Castile and León," although Ferdinand had been named "King of Castile and León." Ferdinand was obliged to observe Castile's law and customs and live in those kingdoms. Furthermore, Ferdinand could not appoint any alien born outside of Castile to the offices and ecclesiastical positions, nor could he undertake war or peace treaties without Isabella's authorisation, but he had to bind himself to fight the Moors. In addition, he, like Philip of Spain, was not permitted to take his wife nor any of their children from her people.⁴⁶ As a whole, being little more than a king consort, Ferdinand was

⁴⁵ Intriguingly, the Spanish precedent of joint rule did not diminish Prince Philip's dislike of the conditions set down by England for his marriage to Mary. He seemed intensely dissatisfied with the marriage treaty. Instead, he felt that his honour had been greatly disparaged and viewed all the conditions as too detrimental to Habsburg interests to be acceptable. However, it was his father who dominated negotiations with England and had no hesitation in agreeing to the majority of the English conditions, probably with his personal presumption that Mary might make substantial concessions to him and to Philip after the marriage. See Loades, *The Reign of Mary Tudor*, 121-24.

⁴⁶ The text of *capitulaciounes* printed in Ballesteros Gaibrois, *Isabel de Castilla*, 234-41. For its content also can see Fernández-Armesto, *Ferdinand and Isabella*, 10-14; Peggy K. Liss, *Isabel the Queen: Life and Times* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 79-80.

far from a fully empowered monarch. He was never capable of exercising independent interventions in Castilian affairs in the reign of Isabella.⁴⁷

The institutions of joint rule of both Isabella and Mary were based on the principle of mother/female inheritance and of the avoidance of foreign takeover. Any of Prince Philip's children not born out of his marriage with Queen Mary were not permitted to claim the English crown, and even if there were none from this marriage, Philip was prohibited from succeeding to the throne. Likewise, Isabella's crown of Castile was passed to their daughters, not to Ferdinand, when it lacked a male heir.⁴⁸ If the principle of joint rule can be represented as the Spanish chroniclers declared by the motto of Isabella and Ferdinand, '*Tanto Monta, Monta Tanto, Fernando como Isabel, Isabel como Fernando*' (One is equal to the other, Ferdinand as much as Isabella, Isabella as much as Ferdinand), the contrast between this slogan and their actual marriage contract nevertheless becomes very odd and intriguing. In fact, both Isabella's and Mary's marriage treaties were founded on the supremacy of their own native countries. This fact manifested that, for the queen's countrymen, the success and acceptability of a ruling queen's marriage with a foreign

⁴⁷ This even worked in 1475 when Ferdinand was granted full authority in Castile in Isabella's absence "to provide, command, create and ordain," because of the war of succession. His martial expertise entitled him to be supreme commander of the army, nevertheless, the Castilians and the Queen still strictly insisted on the terms of their capitulation. Isabella wielded sole authority over the appointment of military governors, the summons of soldiers to war, and even determining the salaries of the soldiers. The authority over tax collections also remained alone to her. See Nancy Rubin, *Isabella of Castile: The First Renaissance Queen* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991), 132; Geoffrey Woodward, *Spain in the Reigns of Isabella and Ferdinand, 1474-1516* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1997), 20.

⁴⁸ According to the chronicle of Fernando del Pulgar, when Isabella discussed the question of succession rights with Ferdinand, she insisted on the female inheritance by which their first daughter, Princess Isabel, should be the sole heir of the Castilian Crown, which frustrated Ferdinand's scheme of male supremacy. Fernández-Armesto, *Ferdinand and Isabella*, 13-14.

prince depended only on the avoidance of the primary hazard of foreign domination and on support of native political supremacy. Both queens also understood that they had to take serious consideration of their people's anxiety over alien domination.

III. The Act for the queen's regal power

Mary's whole program of joint rule was not fully accomplished until a further constitutional affirmation of the queen's regal power was passed in the Parliament of April 1554. This Parliament primarily sought to ratify the Queen's marriage treaty and extended the treason law to protect Philip.⁴⁹ But before the ratification of the marriage treaty had been completed, another bill "declaring that the Regall Power of this Realme is in the Quenes Majestie as fully and absolutely as ever it was in any of her moste noble Progenitours Kinges of this Realme" was passed in the Commons on 10 April and in the Lords two days later. The bill has been viewed by historians as an anomaly, one which logically should have been dealt with in the first parliament to rectify the uncertainties of the Queen's constitutional position.⁵⁰ Historians generally lack information about it and have a diverse opinions and explanations for it. William Fleetwood's dialogue, *Itinerarium ad Windsor* (1575), however,

⁴⁹ Simon Renard to the Emperor, 3 April 1554, *CSP Sp.*, XII, 201.

⁵⁰ See Loades, *The Reign of Mary Tudor*, 146, n.134; Loach, *Parliament and the Crown*, 96-97. For the discussion and controversy of this Act of queen's regal power see W. H. Dunham, "Regal Power and the Rule of Law," *Journal of British Studies* 3-2 (1963-4): 24-56; Dennis Moore, "Recorder Fleetwood and the Tudor Queenship Controversy," in *Ambiguous Realities: Women in the Middle Ages and Renaissance*, eds. Carole Levin and Jeanie Watson (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1987), 235-51; and J. D. Alsop, "The Act for the Queen's Regal Power, 1554," *Parliamentary History* 13-3 (1994): 261-76.

provides a unique insight into this situation as an account of a conspiracy behind this bill. Yet neither D. M. Loades nor Jennifer Loach takes this material seriously since Fleetwood's account lacks other supporting sources, but both of them suggest that this bill originated from perceived uncertainties of the queen's constitutional position and an attempt to forestall future difficulties.⁵¹

Fleetwood's narration is nevertheless considered by J. D. Alsop to be a valuable contemporary source, and he even attempts to verify that his story contains plausible elements. According to Fleetwood's account, a man, probably Sir Robert Rochester, a privy councillor, asked the Queen to consider a "plattforme" proposed by some of the Queen's advisors, suggesting that "take vpon her title of a Conquerour ouer all her dominions: Then might she at her pleasure reforme the Monasteries, aduance her friendes, and suppress her enimies, establishe the Religion, And do what she list," for "there is not any statute extant, made either with or against the Prince of this Realm, wherein the name of a Queene is once expressed."⁵² This platform aimed to build Mary's absolutism and justified it by the reason that there had not been any English laws opposed to this establishment. Fleetwood indicates that the Queen read this scheme and found herself disliking it, considering that it broke her coronation oath and endangered her crown. Subsequently, Mary handed the platform to Stephen Gardiner and commanded him to give a response. Gardiner viewed the argument as a "naughty" device and therefore drew up a legislation with

⁵¹ Loach, *Parliament and the Crown*, 97; Loades, *Mary Tudor*, 2.

⁵² William Fleetwood, *Itinerarium ad Windsor*, British Library, Harley MS. 6234, fos. 20-23v. It is also printed in Alsop, "The Act for the Queen's Regal Power," 273-76.

the approval of the Queen in order to thwart the absolutist conspiracy. J. D. Alsop suggests that the position assigned to Gardiner in Fleetwood's account does match with his political circumstance in 1554, in consideration of his faith in the constitutional continuity in laws and ancient customs binding the rulers.⁵³

Alsop is more successful in validating Fleetwood's account than other historians. However, one fact that historians, including Alsop, usually neglect is Mary's position in this story. It was Mary herself who actively rejected the device and inspired Gardiner to draw up the legislation. Moreover, Fleetwood points out that "her highness thanked the said Lord Chancellour very much, and without any tarrying she tooke the said booke [platform], and presently cast it into the fyer;" she then commanded those advisors never to attempt "either the same or the like most lewd and deuilshe deuice" which meant to legalise the Queen's absolute political power.⁵⁴

This event showed that there were forces behind the scenes encouraging Mary towards greater absolutism. Mary, however, was more conscious of constitution than we usually assume and also more aware of the public opinion on this occasion than she had been during the controversy over her Spanish match (which will be discussed in Chapter 5). Mary's forcible reaction (or perhaps an intentional demonstration) indeed matched with her own circumstances in early 1554 when the need to build her image as the protector of English welfare and freedom was the most

⁵³ Alsop, "Act for the Queen's Regal Power," 271-2.

⁵⁴ Fleetwood, *Itinerarium ad Windsor*, f. 23v.

important challenge to her. This need mostly resulted from the widespread opposition to her Spanish marriage, from the party in the Council and Parliament where many members supported a native match, and from the uprisings in the localities against the Queen's foreign match. Many people alleged that the marriage would subordinate the country into Spanish hands.⁵⁵ Nevertheless, the absolutists' platform, rather contravening the need to soothe people's abhorrence of Spanish marriage, subtly hinted that the Queen could lawfully send the English crown to Prince Philip because she could do anything at her pleasure.

More critically, it was said that the motivation behind this platform came from the Spanish ambassadors.⁵⁶ If the Queen accepted this device, it seemed to declare bluntly the possibility that she, being a dutiful wife to the Prince of Spain, would grant as much benefit to the Spaniards as she could. However, Mary had promised since her early reign that she, as the "natural and liege sovereign lady and Queen," would maintain the laws, liberties and customs as all "others our most noble progenitors have heretofore been," who certainly were bound by some laws and customs.⁵⁷ Moreover, she pledged that if the marriage with Philip took place, she

⁵⁵ The antipathy to a Spanish match showed up almost in all classes of society. In the Queen's Council, the match was strongly opposed by Stephen Gardiner. Moreover, D. M. Loades indicates that a conspiracy among the opponents of the marriage had come into existence at the end of November 1553, composed of some members of the House of Commons, some of Mary's earliest supporters, probably led by William Thomas. See Loades, *The Reign of Mary Tudor*, 124-25. In addition, Simon Renard reporting on 11 and 12 December revealed that a plot against the alliance was woven by several councillors and nobles, led by the Earl of Derby. See his letters to the Emperor, *CSP Sp.*, XI, 425, 431. Furthermore, in the local level, there were at least four uprisings since January 1554; one in Devon, led by Courtenay or Sir Peter Carew; one in Leicestershire led by the Duke of Suffolk; one on the Welsh borders led by Sir James Croftes; and one in Kent led by Sir Thomas Wyatt. See Loades, *Two Tudor Conspiracies*, 12-88.

⁵⁶ G. Burnet, *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England*, II (London: T. H. for Richard Chiswell, 1683), 277-79.

⁵⁷ *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, II, 1.

likewise would not forget the promise which she had made to her first husband—England—on the day of her coronation that “the government of the realm should remain in her Majesty and not in the Prince.”⁵⁸ In addition, she had given her assurance that she would not permit her husband to “encroach in the government of the kingdom,” or “hurt of any of you my commons, or the impeachment of any part or parcel of the royal state of this realm of England.” She further promised, “on the word of a queen,” to defer her matrimony to the arbitration of the Parliament.⁵⁹ Therefore, if she accepted the absolutists’ plot, she would both break her promise to her people and ruin the representation of a caring and loving ruler. The implicit message in this platform would also endanger the success of her foreign match and even her crown.

Consequently, the statute drawn up by Gardiner for the legal equation of kings and queens was legalised with the Queen’s active approval in order to reinforce her promise to subjects and thereby to guarantee the success of Spanish match. This statute, enacted by the Parliament of April 1554, declared that

the Law of this Realme is and ever hathe been and ought to bee understande, that the Kinglye or Regall Office of the Realme, and all Dignities Prerogative Royall Power, . . . being invested either in Male or Female, are and bee and ought to bee as fully wholly absolutely and [enteerly] demed judged accepted invested and taken in thone as in thother; so that what or whansoever Statute or Law dooth lymitte and appointe that the King of this Realme may or shall have execute and doo any thing as king, . . . , The same the Quene⁶⁰

⁵⁸ The Council to Dr. Wotton, 7 December 1553, *CSP For.*, 35.

⁵⁹ Renard to the Emperor, 12 October 1553, *CSP Sp.*, XI, 290; Foxe, VI, 415.

⁶⁰ I. Mary, st. 3, cap. 1, *Statutes of the Realm*, IV, ii, 222.

It granted the queen to have all the powers of the preceding kings, specifying that the regal office, for both rights and limitations, was the same for males and females. Consequently, the queen's rule, although bound by the same restrictions as the king's, was constitutionally confirmed to have the same legality as king's rule. Accordingly, the first English female monarchy took shape in legal terms.

The act "touching the Articlcs of the Queen's Higness most noble marriage" was then ratified on 12 April 1554, which followed the act of the queen's regal power and further defined the political relationship between the Queen and her husband. It is significant that a term "a sole Quene" was added to the contents based on the marriage treaty proclaimed on three months earlier,

. . . that your Majestie as our onelye Quene, shall and maye solye and as a sole Quene, use have and enjoye the Crowne and Soverayntie of an over your Realms Dominions and Subjectes, with all the Preheminences Prerogatives Dignities, . . . in suche sole and onelye estate and in as large and ample maner and fourme in all degrees acts exercise and condicions, from and after the solemnizacion of the sayd Mariage, . . . without any right title estate claime or demaunde to be geven comme or growen unto the sayd most noble Prynce as Tenaunte by the Courtesye of this Realme⁶¹

Thus it was constitutionally assured that the realm belonged only to the Queen, the only and sole Queen of England. In a sense, these two acts ratified in April 1554 were to pursue the same purpose—the legality of the rule of a married queen regnant.

Returning to Fleetwood's account, the circumstantial evidence from Mary's situation in early 1554 reinforces its plausibility to some degree. His account is not only compatible with Gardiner's desire to impede Spanish infiltration in England, but

⁶¹ I. Mary, st. 3, cap. 2, *Statutes of the Realm*, IV, ii, 225.

also with Mary's attempt to convince her subjects of her attention to public good in order to enhance the acceptability of her rule and marriage. Furthermore, it coincides with the overall program of Mary's joint rule, which lay in the prerequisite that the entire English kingdom belonged only to the Queen, who had the same power as all her progenitors.

The institution of the first English female monarchy was basically completed in April 1554, and the pattern of joint rule was concluded when the marriage of Mary and Philip was celebrated on 25 July 1554. We might ask how far Mary identified and fashioned herself as a king, a male persona, given that the act of 1554 had authorised the queen to do anything a king was authorised to do. Yet, as a woman brought up with the traditional conception of the female sex supported by her humanist education, Mary's self-fashioning as the sole head of a country was relatively weak, in contrast with her strong-willed decisiveness in claiming the crown. She was never enthusiastic in conveying a powerful or a kingly image as a ruler as her grandmother Isabella of Castile had done or as her sister Elizabeth would do. Mary's role as a king (not only a queen) also became more obscure as Philip took precedence over Mary in their royal style and in all the royal proclamations thereafter.⁶² Only at her funeral in 1558, in the sermon preached by Bishop White of Winchester, was it stated that

“she was a king's daughter, she was a king's sister, she was a king's wife: she was a queen, and by the same title a king also. She was a sister to her,

⁶² See *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, II, 45-46. It pronounced that “Philip and Mary by the grace of God King and Queen of England, France, Naples, Jerusalem, and Ireland; Defenders of the Faith; Princes of Spain and Sicily”

that by the like title and right is both king and queen, at this present, of this realm.”⁶³

More crucially, Mary's image of a powerful and independent ruler was further diminished during the controversy of Philip's regency which was raised from the end of 1554 to the beginning of 1555. By mid-September 1554, Mary believed herself to be pregnant. Owing to the general danger of giving birth, care was taken to establish a regency of the anticipated heir if Mary were to die, and therefore Philip's position was reconsidered. Finally, after some resistance, a bill for the limitation of treasons and also for the “Government of the Kyngs and Quenes Majesties Issue” was passed on 14 January 1555 by the Commons and on 16 by the Lords.⁶⁴

This bill, consistent with father's traditional power, granted Philip the guardianship of a female child until she reached her majority at fifteen and that of a male child until eighteen. Moreover, it granted Philip to take the responsibility of the “Rule, Order, Education, and Governement of the said Issue or Issues.”⁶⁵ Hence, Philip was given not only the person of the heir by this bill, but also the control of the realm during the heir's minority by the significance of this bill. Although this bill insisted that all the terms contained in the marriage treaty of Mary and Philip should remain in force during such a regency, Philip's faith over the treaty was widely distrusted. The survival of Mary's and England's independence was thus looked upon with suspicion.

⁶³ This sermon is printed in Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, III. ii. 546 .

⁶⁴ For the details see Harbison, *Rival Ambassadors*, 217-22; Loach, *Parliament and the Crown*, 117-23; and Loades, *Mary Tudor*, 117-19.

⁶⁵ I&II Philip & Mary, cap. 10, *Statutes of the Realm*, VI, ii, 256.

Mary damaged her self-image as “sole quene” further on the occasion of her pregnancy.⁶⁶ Contrasting with her failure, the first Renaissance ruling queen, Isabella of Castile, had a even stronger image during her pregnancy. Isabella was pregnant in 1476 when the king of Portugal launched his invasion in the spring of the year, she nonetheless still heedlessly rode out of Toledo in May in order to approach the battle. She eventually suffered a miscarriage three days later, yet demonstrated extraordinary courage and gained high praise from her chroniclers who noted that “even in the hour of childbirth she disguised her sufferings and forced herself neither to show nor utter the pain that in that hour women are wont to feel and manifest.”⁶⁷ This was a supreme effort of the first Renaissance queen regnant to elaborate on an image of a male-like ruler. In contrast, Mary was by her pregnancy to further diminish her role as a king.

IV. Obedience and Disobedience to the female monarchy

The reign of Mary, although successfully accommodating the first English female monarchy, lacked theoretical defence or official publications to advance the acceptability of woman's rule. The reasons perhaps are that the vast majority of book production in the reign of Mary concentrated on ecclesiastical works, while

⁶⁶ More about the influence of Mary's pregnancy on her image see Chapter 1, 55-61.

⁶⁷ Cited from Marvin Lunenfeld, “Isabella I of Castile and the Company of Women in Power,” *Historical Reflections* 4-2 (1977): 218.

others were aimed at the continental audience, instead of the domestic one.⁶⁸ But it is still striking that the first English female monarchy produced so little of interest from Catholic apologists to justify the righteousness of female rulership. Most government propaganda focused on religious unity and allegiance to Roman Church, such as James Brooks's *A Sermon very Notable, Fruictefull and Godlie* (1553?) and Thomas Watson's *Two Notable Sermons Made before the Quenes Highnes* (1555).⁶⁹ The only two tracts concerned with Mary's rule are James Cancellar's *The Path of Obedience* and John Christopherson's *An Exhortation to All menne to Take Hede and Beware of Rebellion*. Both of the authors were Mary's chaplains and their works were probably officially inspired and dedicated to the Queen to promote subjects' obedience to Mary's rule.

Another fundamental reason for the fact that there is no specific work devoted to the theoretical defence for the legitimacy of female sovereignty can be attributed in Mary and her supporters' preoccupation with the Queen's legal status. At Mary's accession and during her early reign, all the efforts put into the legality of Mary's sovereignty demonstrated that they defined and legitimated female rule primarily through Mary's legitimacy as Henry VIII's lawful daughter and heir, and through the constitutional supplements. Mary, as mentioned in the previous section, was

⁶⁸ Mary's Catholic government seemed to produce few successful official works to defend women's rule as Jennifer Loach indicates in her "Pamphlets and Politics, 1553-8," *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 48 (1975): 31, that "the remarkable feature of pamphleteering in Mary's reign is that the works of critics of the regime are both more numerous and more able than those of government supporters." But Loach suggests in another paper that actually "a very substantial part of her [Mary] government's propaganda effort was not written in English, therefore, nor even printed in London. It is perhaps for this reason that historians have failed to recognise its full scope." See her "The Marian Establishment and the Printing Press," *English Historical Review* 101 (1986): 144.

⁶⁹ *STC* 3838; *STC* 25115.

convinced that it was natural and definitive for all subjects to pay obedience and allegiance to her rule, as long as her legitimacy and constitutional status had been confirmed. This ideology is clearly reflected in the theme of the works written by Cancellor and Christopherson, which particularly emphasised political obedience to the Queen.

In England, Catholics became reluctant to proclaim subjects' obedience to secular princes during the Henrician Reformation and Edwardian Protestantism. In that period, some Catholics, such as Thomas More, John Fisher and Reginald Pole, took a form of passive resistance to the government, choosing the routes of martyrs or exiles. Even Mary herself was struggling in her religious nonconformity with the Church of England. She, like most Catholics when encountering an ungodly government, emphasised obedience to ecclesiastical jurisdiction, or followed the judge of her personal conscience. In particular, in 1549 when the Catholic mass was in the front line of controversy, Mary showed her obstinate opposition to Edward and his Council's policy of abolishing the mass and other traditional rites.⁷⁰

The early Lutherans and English reformists, nevertheless, chose to elaborate the idea of political obedience to the secular prince, precluding submission to ecclesiastical authority. In the political teachings of Martin Luther, a notable feature is that despite his emphasis on the idea that "we must obey God . . . rather than men," he equally stressed a contrasting principle deriving from the Pauline doctrine that "the powers that be are ordained of God." Luther argued that even an ungodly ruler

⁷⁰ For the details see Loades, *Mary Tudor*, 142-50; 157-70.

must never be actively resisted since all powers are ordained and people's insurrection and rebellion against governors would be viewed as a great sin since they infringe upon the will and ordinance of God; therefore, people must patiently receive their rulers' oppression and even brutality as suffering for their own sins.⁷¹

Luther's idea of non-resistance, based on the word of God, exercised a massive influence among earlier Lutherans, such as Melanchthon, Osiander and Eberlin von Günzburg. His idea is particularly demonstrated in William Tyndale's *The Obedience of a Christian Man* (1528) which went into numerous editions in the sixteenth century.⁷² Tyndale's work elucidates the obedience subjects owed to the rulers as being identical to that of children to their parents, wives to their husbands, or servants to their masters, just as God ordained; hence, under no circumstances could a subject legitimately resist the ruler's commandments. Moreover, Tyndale was also the first person who proposed a strong defence of secular authorities, insisting that all existing jurisdictions claimed by the Pope and the Catholic Church were illegal, should be abolished and taken over by the secular governments.⁷³ His view was thus immensely welcomed in the official campaign of political propaganda for Henry VIII's Reformation in 1530s, which claimed for the King instead of the Pope, the right to be the head of the Church of England. Such tracts include

⁷¹ See Martin Luther, *Temporal Authority: to what Extent it Should be Obeyed*, trans. J. J. Schindel in *Luther's Works*, 45, ed. Walther I Brandt (Philadelphia, Muhlenberg Press, 1962), 75-129. For his idea of non-resistance see Edgar Carlson, "Luther's Conception of Government," *Church History* 15 (1946): 257-70; and Quentin Skinner, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, II (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), 16-19, 67-74.

⁷² Antwerp, 1528, STC 24446 (reprinted Amsterdam: Theatrum Orbis Terrarum Ltd., 1977).

⁷³ Skinner, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, II, 72.

Richard Sampson's *An Oration Teaching Obedience* (1534), Stephen Gardiner's *The Oration of True Obedience* (1535),⁷⁴ and Thomas Starky's *An Exhortation to the People* (1536), all intending to defend the King's divorce and royal supremacy, and of course the absolute political submission to the King.

With the accession of Catholic Mary, her government immediately faced the problem of political obedience. Although Lutherans' and Henrician reformists' denial of the pope's political authority was contrary to the doctrine of Mary's counter-reformation, her apologists still assimilated some of Lutheran theory of non-resistance, stressing that power was ordained by God. However, instead of using St Paul's teaching as their central argument, both Cancellor's *The Path of Obedience* and Christopherson's *An Exhortation* returned to the scholastic concept of a universe ruled by order and hierarchy. Apart from that, their arguments were supported more by sources from the Old Testament than from the New Testament.

James Cancellor, "one of the Queen's Majesty's most hon. chapel" as he described himself,⁷⁵ perhaps wrote his work soon after Mary's accession, responding to Northumberland's insidious attempt to take away the title and right of Mary after the death of Edward VI. He stresses that both the church and state contain diversities as social hierarchies, as ordained by the will and hand of God. Good

⁷⁴ Gardiner, the great advisor to Mary, was not a sincere apologist during the Henrician schism, and afterwards expressed his repentance for writing the *Oration*, see Pierre Janelle ed, *Obedience in Church and State: Three Political Tracts by Stephen Gardiner* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1930), lix. More about the apologists and opponents of Henrician Reformation, see L. B. Smith, *Tudor Prelates and Politics 1536-1558* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953), and A. G. Dickens, *The English Reformation* (2nd., London: Batsford Ltd., 1989).

⁷⁵ Cited in *Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. 3, 857.

order depends on the obedience and reverence of the lower and meaner to the nobler and the more intelligent, just as the weaker conform to the stronger in nature. He declares that God established political rule by this order, "so god hath appointed here, kings and maiestates, vnto whom he hath geuen auctorite to rule a[nd] gouerne the weale publike, for as much as the said persons excelling in knowledge wherby other be gouerned."⁷⁶ Therefore, the king, as God ordained, is the head to reign over all his subjects who must be humbly obedient to him as to God, "whosoeuer therefore resisteth y^e power he resisteth the ordiaunce of god and he y^t resisteth the ordiaunce of god, striueth against god."⁷⁷

Cancellor furthermore recites the story of Adam's disobedience. The tree of knowledge of good and evil is a test set before Adam by God: if he was obedient and took no fruit from the tree, he would have God's blessing; if he was disobedient, the curse would follow. However, Adam disobeyed the will and commandment of his Lord, thereby "whyche before were most precyous and pure in the sight of God, are now become before God, hatefull and odious."⁷⁸ Cancellor indicates that all men fell from the paradise to this miserable world because of the first man's disobedience, and

Through the disobedience of one man, many became sinners soo that dysobedience broughte sinne, and sinne broughte death vnto Adam and hys hole posteritie.

⁷⁶ Cancellor, *The Path of Obedience*, sig. C6r-v.

⁷⁷ Ibid., sig. C8v.

⁷⁸ Ibid., sig. B2v-3r.

Hence, he calls disobedience not only as an “ugly monster,” but also a great sin for which God would never “suffer anyone to be unpunished.”⁷⁹

Similarly, John Christopherson, the chaplain and confessor to the Queen, blames in his *Exhortation* the late uprising (Wyatt's rebellion) that those rebels “haue caste away the feare of God, which worketh in mens hartes humbel a[nd] dewe obedience to God a[nd] their prince.” He refutes further any reason which can lawfully uphold rebellions against rulers, “in rebelling they mooste grievously offende their lord God, a[nd] so putte their soules in ieopardie,” since a prince “whom he is by God commaunded mooste humbly to obeye.”⁸⁰ Agreeing with Cancellor, Christopherson argues that God has made men rich and poor, higher and lower, “gentlemen and simple, rulers and subiectes, And euerye one are placed in their degree,” as it pleases God to appoint them.⁸¹ These degrees as he declares exist in every society, and are necessary for good order, therefore, those poorer or more lowly should suffer their situation patiently and quietly as if to bear their temporal punishment.

Although Christopherson provides his arguments mainly with the support from the Old Testament, ancient and English histories, he also cites St Paul's doctrine (Romans 13) to enhance the idea of absolute obedience: “that euery man ought to obey y^e higher powers, because they be ordeyned of God, and whosoeuer withstandeth the power, withstaudeth the ordinaunce of God.”⁸² Christopherson thus suggests that under no circumstances should subjects oppose their rulers with

⁷⁹ Ibid., sig. B3r, 6v.

⁸⁰ Christopherson, *An Exhortation*, sig. A6r.

⁸¹ Ibid., sig. C5.

⁸² Ibid., sig. C8v.

violence, no matter to what extent their wealth or liberty is tyrannically oppressed, since all is ordained by God. When they suffer a cruel ruler, they can only seek amends through humble petition to the prince, and if this is unsuccessful, then to God. Moreover, Christopherson argues that people should speculate on “for what purpose God hath sent vs suche a wicked prince, whether through our noughtye lyfe we have deserued to haue such a noughtye ruler, or y^t God hathe suffered him to reynge ouer vs for a trial of oure patience.” From time to time, an evil and tyrannical ruler might be ordained by God on account of the people's sin, therefore, Christopherson recommends that they must patiently abide the nomination of God and bear the wicked ruler.⁸³ In short, people are “commaunded by the holye worde of God, to be obediente, not onely to good princes but to noughtie princes to,” nevertheless, their godly virtue of patience should be highly rewarded in the future.⁸⁴

Christopherson's viewpoint is strikingly similar to Luther's when he considers the idea of “rather obeye God then man,” declining to defend the faith by the sword. If a ruler commands his subjects to act in evil or ungodly ways, contrary to the will of God, the subjects must never obey, “neyter must we do it, lest we highlye displease God, nor we muste not by force of armes resiste the Prince, lest we damne our own soules.” None the less, Christopherson argues that people should follow the steps of the apostles and martyrs to suffer for their own faith rather than violently resist the

⁸³ Ibid., sig. D7r.

⁸⁴ Ibid., sig. E1r, H4r.

ungodly ruler, "not in doing hys commaundement, whych is damnable, but in patient sufferyng of paynful tormentes."⁸⁵

Cancellor and Christopherson, through the idea of obedience, attempt to extend the same political obligation which subjects paid to kings to the first female monarch, Queen Mary. However, they had to face at least two questions before they could actually reach this goal. First, they needed to handle the traditional restriction on the female sex in the political sphere. Next, they had to convince people to obey a woman's judgement on religious matters even though St. Paul taught that women must keep silence in the congregation. Gardiner, in his sermon preached on 2 December 1554, lamented that the Church of England had no head at all, for "the queen, being a woman, could not be head of the church."⁸⁶ If a woman could not be the head of the church, Chancellor and Christopherson had to answer whether the Queen could lawfully promote religious alterations in her own right and coerce her subjects to observe them.

Nevertheless, both Chancellor and Christopherson failed to address directly those questions mentioned above, lacking a theoretical defence of the queen's rule to challenge either traditional perception of women or St. Paul's teaching on female silence. Neither do they follow the pattern of some humanist treatises which uphold woman's rulership by revaluing woman's virtue and capability, such as Thomas Elyot's *The Defence of Good Women* (1540) and Henry Cornelius Agrippa's *Of the*

⁸⁵ Ibid., sig. H5r.

⁸⁶ Foxe, VI, 577-78.

Nobilitie and Excellencie of Womankynde (1542). Generally, they make little contribution to the rethinking of woman's participation in the fields of religion and politics, much less enhancing the Queen's political superiority to her husband.

Their strategy of defending is to consider submission to the Queen and to God as one thing; that is to say, to disobey the Queen is to disobey God. Both of them advocate that the restoration of old religion in England is moved by God and the Queen together, and the Queen's judgement on religious matters perfectly reflects God's judgement. Therefore, anyone who rises up against the Queen will be "a false traytoure to God."⁸⁷ It seems to them that the ruler's gender is irrelevant to obedience to a secular ruler, as long as he/she is chosen by God. The legitimacy of Mary's sovereignty thus could be justified by God's providence. As Christopherson declares, the Queen "is the humble handemayde of God, elected and chosen by him to rule and reforme this realm, whiche was so farre oute of order" Hence, her rule and all her delight and pleasure are to "see gods glory auaunced, and this her Realme recouer the honorable state, that it hathe bene in time past."⁸⁸ He believes that the Queen's providence is clearly verified by her victory over the Duke of Northumberland's plot, Wyatt's insurrection and all her enemies, for "God would not suffer eyther such a vertuouse Lady, and a pure virgine to be destroyed, or his catholike fayth, whych he had of late by her so gratioously restored, to be by thenemyes of his church with violent force ouerthrowen."⁸⁹ Furthermore,

⁸⁷ Christopherson, *An Exhortation*, sig. O1r, J7r.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, sig. M1v.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, sig. O2v-3r.

Christopherson emphasises that the Queen is the person sent by God to “redresse thinges that are out of order,” to deliver her subjects out of their misery. He even makes words for God to utter: “I wyll by the hande of myne humbel handemayde Marye saue my people of Englande from the assaultes of their enemyes.”⁹⁰ Mary's rule, consequently, is viewed as a clear sign of God's grace towards English people, and therefore the legitimacy of Mary's rule is firmly founded on divine favour, so that any dissent against her rule is unforgivable. This argument significantly strengthens the righteousness of Mary's government and brings in a sense of divine commission to her rule, which apparently had shared by Mary herself perceiving her rule and marriage as expressions of God's will.

Taken altogether, Mary and her supporters' perceptions of the queen's political authority still remained in the sphere of traditional obedience to higher power as linked to the will of God. At this point, Marian apologists had only reiterated what had been expressed about order and social hierarchy in the reign of Henry VIII and what Elizabethans would take for granted.⁹¹ The arguments of both Cancellar and Christopherson never note concern for the ruler's gender, but focus on religious conformity to the Catholic Church. Put in another way, they had not considered gender to be an issue as it was in the works of Protestant polemics, although religion was pivotal to the both sides. Therefore, they lacked a substantial justification and advancement of the woman's rule, and only palely emphasised the Queen's

⁹⁰ Ibid., sig. P5r, P6-8, Q7v-8r.

⁹¹ See E. M. W. Tillyard, *The Elizabethan World Picture* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1943), 7-15.

legitimacy in legal terms and God's providence. The weakness of Catholic propaganda becomes more obvious in comparison with Protestant arguments against political allegiance to Mary. Several Marian exiles in opposition to Marian religious policies, posed new reflections on the question of obedience in a different perspective: the gender and fitness of the ruler. These more revolutionary Protestants, such as Thomas Becon, John Ponet, Christopher Goodman, Antony Gilby and John Knox, based their views on Luther's idea "to obey God rather than Man," putting forward a theory of active disobedience.⁹² Their arguments for rebellion are, more or less, tellingly grounded in the prevalent conception of the natural inferiority of women, although in reality their objection emanates from Mary's Catholicism.

The earliest work of these Protestant treatises was Thomas Becon's *An Humble Supplication unto God* (1554). He refers to the teachings of the Scriptures (especially Genesis 3:16 and 1 Timothy 2:11-12) where woman's inferiority and silence are of predominant importance. Thus he complained that "in stead of that virtuous prince thou [God] hast set to rule over us a woman, whom nature hath formed to be in subjection unto man, and whom thou by thine holy apostle commandest to keep silence, and not to speak in the congregation." He therefore views the fact of Mary's rule as a token of God's displeasure, "Ah Lord! to take away

⁹² However, their idea of active disobedience is hardly the mainstream in Marian exiles. Most of the exiles continued to urge the obligation of obedience, preferring to bear the suffering rather than violently resist secular authority. At most, some endeavoured to persuade people to bring about change within the framework of the constitution, making petitions to the nobility or to the peers. See Loach, "Pamphlets and Politics, 1553-8," 38-42.

the empire from a man, and to give it unto a woman, seemeth to be an evident token of thine anger toward us Englishmen.”⁹³ He proceeds to compare Mary to several wicked queens in history, such as Queen Jesabel, Queen Athalia and Queen Herodias.

Following the same line of reasoning, Christopher Goodman, in his *How Superior Powers ought to be Obeyd* (1558) also perceives Mary's rule as God's punishment for the sin of English people, and similarly compares Mary to those cruel queens Jesabel and Athalia, “this vngodlie serpent Marie, the chief instrument of all this present miserie in Engliande.”⁹⁴ Moreover, he advocates that woman's rule violates the law of nature and the Word of God, for God commanded men to choose kings “from amongst their brethern, and not from their sisters: who are forbiddn as persons vnmete to speake in a Congregacion: be you your selues iudges, and let nature teache you the absurditie therof.” Therefore, woman's rule which is “monster in nature and disordre amongst men,” is a subversion of divine law and God's ordinance.⁹⁵ Furthermore, Goodman directly renounces Mary's legitimacy in inheritance because she is “a woman begotten in adultrie a bastard by birthe, contrarie to the worde of God and your own laws. And therfore condemned as a bastarde by the iudgement of all Vniuersities in England, France, and Italie,”⁹⁶

⁹³ Thomas Becon, *An Humble Supplicacion unto God, for the restoringe of hys holye woorde unto the churche of Englande* (Strasburgh, 1554, STC 1730), in *Prayers and Other Pieces of Thomas Becon*, ed. John Ayre (1884; reprint ed., Cambridge, 1968), 227.

⁹⁴ Christopher Goodman, *How Superior Powers ought to be Obeyd of their subjects, and wherin they may lawfully by Gods worde be disobdyed and resisted* (Geneva, 1558, STC 12020, Amsterdam: Theatrum Orbis Terrarvm Ltd., 1972), sig. C1v-2r, F8v, G1v.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, sig. C1v-2r, F8v, D2r-v, D3r.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, sig. G1r.

Thus, the legality of Mary's rule was repudiated not only by divine law, but also by positive or customary law.

The strongest and most relentless protest against Mary's Catholicism was written by John Knox, *The First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regiment of Women* (1558).⁹⁷ Knox similarly and more largely focuses his objection on Mary's womanhood. He cites both divine law and Roman Law to oppose women participating in public activities. He is convinced that "woman in her greatest perfection was made to serve and obey man, not to rule and command him," and according to "the Rules of the Lawe," "women are removed from all civile publike office, so that they nether may be Judges, nether may they occupie the place of the Magistrate; nether may they be speakers for other."⁹⁸ Echoing Becon and Goodman, Knox asserts that to promote a woman to bear rule is "a monstre in nature," a thing most repugnant to God's will and ordinance, and this subversion of nature is simultaneously an act of tyranny.⁹⁹

As a whole, these radical pamphleteers sought to persuade people to withdraw their obedience and rise up in arms against the tyranny of Mary, as well as her

⁹⁷ John Knox had written to Henry Bullinger in 1554, raising the question "whether a female can preside over, and rule a kingdom by divine right, and so transfer the right of sovereignty to her husband?" He answered that women were normally in subjection to man by the divine law and not to rule, and compare Mary's rule to the ungodly and tyrannous rule of Athaliah. See John Knox, "Certain Questions Concerning Obedience to Lawful Magistrates, with answers by Bullinger," in *The Works of John Knox*, III, ed. David Laing (Edinburgh: James Thin, 1845; reprint, New York: AMS Press, 1966), 222-3. In the same year, Knox wrote a treaty to oppose Mary's Spanish match and her rule: *A Faythfull Admonition to the Professors of God's Truth in England*, in *The Works of John Knox*, III, 251-330.

⁹⁸ John Knox, *The First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrous Regiment of Women*, in *The Works of John Knox*, IV, 377, 375.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 381.

idolatry, since her rule violated both God's laws and man's.¹⁰⁰ Contradicting John Christopherson's conclusion, the Protestants suggest that to obey Mary is to disobey God, and to disobey her is to please God, as Goodman states, ". . . by resisting her selues damnation for their [her councillors] transgression and her wicked decrees, you must be made true worshippers of God, and faithfull Englishe men."¹⁰¹ Thus, these polemical Protestant writings not only bring out the idea of active disobedience, but also a discourse different from Mary and her apologists on the legitimacy of queenship.

Queen Mary's preoccupation was to affirm her sovereignty through the parliamentary legislation and her legitimate status of inheritance. As for Cancellar and Christopherson, the main justification was to authenticate Mary's rule through God's favour and ordinance. But the Protestant opponents challenged the legitimacy of her queenship by natural and divine law in relation to her body: her female sex was perceived as a defect of her rulership. In respect to the ruler's personal defects, John Christopherson in his *Exhortation* had acknowledged that some subjects rose up because of the defects of their rulers, who are "deformed, croked, or has little wit and less experience," but he asserted that "yf the prince lacke

¹⁰⁰ John Ponet's work, *A Shorte Treatise of Politike Power, and of the true obedience which subiectes owe to kynges and other ciuile gouernours* (Strasburg: heirs of W. Köphel, 1556, *STC* 20178) has not been cited in this section. However, he was an important figure among the Marian exiles in building up the theory of active disobedience, yet his theory is grounded less in Mary's womanhood than in her subversion of private law in relation to people's right of property. See Barbara Peardon, "The Politics of Polemic: John Ponet's *Short Treatise of Politic Power* and Contemporary Circumstance 1553-1556," *Journal of British Studies* 22 (1982): 23-34; and Winthrop S. Hudson, *John Ponet (1516?-1556), Advocate of Limited Monarchy* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1942).

¹⁰¹ Goodman, *How Superior Powers ought to be Obeyd*, sig. G4r-v.

good qualities, it is not oure part to fynde faute with him, but to desire God to sende him better.”¹⁰² However, both Christopherson and Mary never seriously regarded the fact that the female sex of a ruler could be a powerful weapon to justify the retraction of subjects' conformity, and therefore did not bother to counter the Protestant arguments.¹⁰³

Indeed, with regard to a ruler's personal liabilities, both the ruler's minor age and female sex were vulnerable in defending his/her authority in the early modern age. Mary's position in defiance of Edward VI's religious innovations before she succeeded to the throne was a remarkable example of the controversy between the king's age and subjects' obedience. A series of letters exchanged between Mary and King Edward and his Council during 1549 and 1551, printed in John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*, reveal Mary's opposition to Edward's authority in the matter of religion. Mary doggedly sticks to two points in her letters. Firstly, she is only in conformity with her own conscience in the matters of religion; secondly, since King Edward was still in his minority, “my brother shall have sufficient years to be a judge in these matters himself.”¹⁰⁴ Consequently, the new law which was passed to debar the mass—the Act of Uniformity—could not be termed as a law in the eyes of Mary. This argument is due to her perception that the King was unable to make mature judgements in matters of religion thanks to his tender age. In other words, by

¹⁰² Christopherson, *An Exhortation*, sig. C3r, F8v- G1r.

¹⁰³ Without theoretical defence, Mary's government only made strenuous efforts to prevent the printing and circulation of opposition pamphlets, although that proved to be unsuccessful. See Loach, “Pamphlets and Politics, 1553-8,” 32-33.

¹⁰⁴ A letter of the Lady Mary to the Council, 22 June 1549, Foxe, VI, 7.

openly holding the mass in her chapel, "I have offended no law, unless it be a late law of your own making, for the altering of matters in religion, which, in my conscience, is not worthy to have the name of a law." Therefore, she would only follow the judgement of God and her father's law which "were all allowed and consented to without compulsion by the whole realm, both spiritual and temporal . . . , so that it was an authorized law."¹⁰⁵ Mary attempted to evade her duty of obedience by ruthlessly pointing out the King's immaturity in her following letters. For instance, in the letter of August 1551, she expresses the same opinion that it is by no means that "your highness can at these years be a judge in matters of religion."¹⁰⁶

Edward's kingship was not perceived by Mary to be completely legal, nor was it empowered the full right of a mature king due to his minor age. King Edward and his Council were enormously irritated by Mary's nonconformity. The Council fought against Mary's opposition by declaring the idea of the "king's two bodies":¹⁰⁷

Her grace must understand, he is a king by the ordinance of God, by descent of royal blood, not by the numbering of his years. As a creature subject to mortality, he hath youth, and . . . shall have age; but, as a king, he hath no difference by days and years. The Scripture plainly declareth it, not only young children to have been kings by God's special ordinance, but also . . . to have had best success in their reign, Therefore her grace hath no cause thus to diminish his majesty's power, and to make him, as it were, no king until she think him of sufficient years.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁵ Ibid.

¹⁰⁶ The Lady Mary to the King's Majesty, 19 August 1551, Foxe, VI, 21.

¹⁰⁷ For the idea of the king's two bodies, see Ernst H. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957).

¹⁰⁸ "A Remembrance of certain Matters appointed by the Council to be declared by Dr. Hopton to the Lady Mary's Grace," 14 June 1549, Foxe, VI, 9.

The Council's response endows the King with two bodies: a natural body and a politic body. His natural body is subject to infancy, infirmity, and old age, but his politic body is held to be unerring and immortal, no matter whether he is young or old. The King himself also asserted that he had the same authority as his father, and "the stories of Scripture be so plenteous, as almost the best ordered church of the Israelites was by kings younger than we be."¹⁰⁹

The question of the ruler's minor age continued to be justified by John Knox in the reign of Mary. Knox and other Marian Protestants basically disagreed with Mary, and did not view the king's minority as weakening his regal authority, as declared in John Knox's letter to Henry Bullinger in 1554. In answer to the question "whether the son of a king, upon his father's death, though unable by reason of his tender age to conduct the government of the kingdom, is nevertheless by right of inheritance to be regarded as a lawful magistrate, and as such to be obeyed as divine right?" Knox argued that a king in his minority should "be esteemed as a lawful King, who is ordained according to the just laws of the country. And thus it is clear that Edward VI of happy memory was ordained." He suggested further that the state can provide a minor king with councillors to aid his rule; "he was therefore a lawful Sovereign, and his laws and ordinances demanded obedience." However, in the case of a woman's rule, even though she could also be provided with

¹⁰⁹ The King's Majesty's Letter to the Lady Mary, 24 January 1550, Foxe, VI, 12.

experienced councillors, Knox still viewed it “a hazardous thing,” and considering her rule to be unlawful and demanding no obedience.¹¹⁰

In comparison to the Edwardian Council's response to Mary's accusation in 1549 and early 1550s and to John Knox's justification, the Marian government had inadequate defence and reacted weakly to Protestant detraction of women's rule. Mary exploited the ruler's tender age to challenge Edward's authority and thereby withdrew her duty of obedience, but when she was in the same position of governing, she was not able to defend attacks on her own womanhood. As for Mary's apologists, they did not learn any good lessons from their opponents, either. King Edward's councillors discerned the significance of the idea of the king's two bodies in defending Edward's youth, nevertheless, Mary's apologists missed the opportunity to make use of a similar theory to give the Queen's two bodies to draw attention away from her female sex. Neither did they adopt Knox's strategy and argue that a body of councillors would assist Mary's rule meaning that a woman's rule was not dangerous at all.

In the whole course of legitimating and establishing her rule, Mary conspicuously focused on the call of her hereditary right based on the will of her father and on the expression of God's providence. She styled herself as the rightful heir to the crown and therefore commanded subjects' allegiance to her political power. Her main concern was to legalise her legitimacy as the lawful child from

¹¹⁰ Knox, “Certain Questions concerning obedience to lawful magistrates,” 221, 222-23.

her parents' marriage, neglecting any issues relating to her sex. Correspondingly, Mary's apologists concentrated only on the idea of absolute political obedience in a traditional framework, overlooking any pro-feminine perspective. Moreover, both the Queen and the writers even neglected the Protestant detraction of the Queen's womanhood, much less managing to achieve an effective counterattack. Ultimately, the theoretical defence of a woman's rule, such as the idea of the queen's two bodies or a more kingly image of the queen, was not fulfilled until the reign of the next female monarch, Elizabeth Tudor.

Nevertheless, historians should take more account of the fact that Mary actively initiated the legislation of the queen's regal power to be equal to that of kings, and successfully followed the Spanish pattern of the joint rule of Isabella and Ferdinand to accommodate the first English female monarchy. It was in the reign of Mary that the construction of a female-governed regime was completed and the necessary constitutional devices for the next female monarch were laid down. We, therefore, should give more value to the achievement of Mary's rule than has been previously recognised.

Chapter 4

Elizabeth's rule and the Legitimacy of Gynecocracy

The first English queen, Mary Tudor, died on the morning of 17 November 1558. Her sister, Elizabeth, was at once proclaimed in the parliament as “the only right heir by blood and lawful succession,” the Queen of England, France, and Ireland.¹ Surprisingly the actual transfer of power from a Catholic queen to a Protestant one was largely peaceful. It seemed that the legitimacy of Elizabeth gave rise to less dispute than that of Mary in her accession. As William Camden advocated, Elizabeth had “the most undoubted title” to the succession, “seeing there is none that can, none that ought, to doubt, the Prelates and Peers had with one voice and mind decreed (in case they would assent) presently to proclaim her Queen.”² However, Elizabeth's legitimacy was not truly beyond doubt since two Popes had pronounced the marriage of her mother, Anne Boleyn, and Henry VIII to be unlawful.³ In the eyes of Rome and the rest of Catholic Europe, Elizabeth Tudor was a bastard, and moreover she was still illegitimate by the Act of Parliament of 1536.⁴

¹ For the announcement of Queen Elizabeth's accession see *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, II, 239-40.

² William Camden, *The History of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princess Elizabeth, late Queen of England*, ed. Wallace T. MacCaffrey (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970), 9.

³ Queen Mary once tried to declare Elizabeth to be a bastard, as having been born while her father was married to Catherine of Aragon. See the ambassadors in England to the Emperor, 30 September 1553, *CSP Sp.*, XI, 260.

⁴ See *Statutes of the Realm*, III, 28, Henry VIII, c7, 655-62. In Henry VIII's Second Succession Act (1536), Henry's marriages with Catherine of Aragon and Anne Boleyn were proclaimed unlawful

Elizabeth's legitimacy to the English throne was actually as disputable as her sister's. Elizabeth's first rival was Mary Stuart, the granddaughter of Henry VIII's sister, who claimed to hold an undeniable hereditary right to the English crown. Mary Stuart, with the support of her husband, the French Dauphin and future Francis II, had openly displayed her pretensions to the English throne in 1559 by assuming the title and arms of England with those of France (while Elizabeth was still styling herself Queen of England and France).⁵ The situation became more perilous for Elizabeth in 1561 when Mary Stuart returned to Scotland. Mary, Queen of Scots, became the converging point of English Catholic dissent and European Catholic powers which attempted either to allege Elizabeth as a usurper (meaning to replace Mary on Elizabeth's throne) or establish Mary as the next person to the throne.⁶ Therefore, the defence of her own legitimacy in rule came to be one of Elizabeth's main challenges.

In addition, Elizabeth suffered from the same disadvantage as her sister: "a woman in a man's seat," as Wallace MacCaffrey suggests.⁷ The Protestant tracts which opposed the government of Mary Tudor had already established an efficacious

and "all the issues and children born and procreated under the same marriage . . . shall be taken, reputed, and accepted illegitimate to all intents and purposes, and shall be utterly foreclosed, excluded, and barred to claim, challenge, or demand any inheritance as lawful heir or heirs to your Highness by lineal descent." Therefore both Mary Tudor and Elizabeth Tudor were clearly declared to be illegitimate, unable to claim the crown. Furthermore, in 1553, Edward VI's Letters Patent excluded Mary and Elizabeth from the succession order and inclined to the line of Suffolk, which justified the accession of Lady Jane Grey. For Edward's Letters Patent, see *Queen Jane and Queen Mary*, 91-99.

⁵ Alison Plowden, *Two Queens in One Isle: the Deadly Relationship of Elizabeth I and Mary, Queen of Scots* (Sussex: the Harvester Press, 1984), 39-40.

⁶ About other rivals in the succession controversy, see Mortimer Levine, *The Early Elizabethan Succession Question 1558-1568* (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1966), 7-11.

⁷ Wallace T. MacCaffrey, *Elizabeth I* (London: Edward Arnold, 1993), 29.

form of literature in attacking female rulers based on women's inferiority in natural and divine law. Two books in particular launched formidable attacks upon the principle of female rule that were directed against Queen Mary yet unintentionally had an impact upon the young Queen Elizabeth. Printed in 1558, John Knox's *The First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regiment of Women* and Christopher Goodman's *How Superior Powers ought to be Obeyed*, made an untimely appearance for the accession of Elizabeth. The new Queen herself also expressed apparent distaste to the authors of both works. Elizabeth's enmity was plainly illustrated when John Knox applied to the English government for permission to pass through Newcastle and Berwick on his way to Scotland in January 1559. His request was imperiously refused. In addition, however, their works caused a kind of perplexity to English Protestants who rightly perceived that any damage to the status of Elizabeth also harmed the promotion of Protestantism in England. Most English Protestants, therefore, had kept distance from both authors. As John Knox later complained, "my First Blast hath blown from me all my friends in England."⁸

The Protestant detraction of women's rule encapsulated the traditional idea of women's incapability in politics. The issue of legitimacy from dynastic succession or hereditary blood was shifted to the person's fitness. That is to say, the legitimacy of a woman's government was not only defined in terms of her hereditary right, but

⁸ Cited from John Knox, *The Works of John Knox*, IV, ed. David Laing (Edinburgh: James Thin, 1845; reprint, New York: AMS Press, 1966), 353.

also in notions of fitness determined by natural disposition and the divine hierarchy. Consequently, Elizabeth faced the same challenge as Mary Tudor to style herself as an adequate ruler. In gender terms, she had to become king as well as queen in order to diminish society's distrust of her womanhood. In other words, Elizabeth and her sister encountered a similar obstacle in relation to the legitimacy of women's rule. This obstacle not only involved the legitimacy of hereditary right, but also the righteousness of a woman's rule or gynecocracy. As we mentioned in the last chapter, Mary put most of her energies into dealing with the legitimacy of her succession, stressing that she was born in lawful matrimony. Mary also successfully built up the first English female monarchy by the legislation of the queen's regal power in 1554. Moreover, Mary's triumph ensured the authority of Henry VIII's Third Succession Act (1544) and his will (30 December 1546) in the controversy over succession.⁹ These two documents secured both Mary's and Elizabeth's succession right by appointing the line of succession after Edward VI first to Henry's own daughters.¹⁰

Under those similar circumstances, this chapter will examine any difference between Mary and Elizabeth in asserting the legitimacy of their rule. The first two sections focus on the ceremonial sources of ruling queens' coronation entries, where

⁹ The Acts of 1536 and 1543 gave the King "full and plenar power" to designate the hereditary order of succession. See *Statutes of the Realm*, III, 28, Henry VIII, c7 and 35 Henry VIII, c1. For the role of Henry's will in the succession controversy see Levine, *The Early Elizabethan Succession Question*, 147-62.

¹⁰ This chapter does not seek to add to the existing knowledge of Tudor dynastic succession problems, since both of Mortimer Levine's works, *Tudor Dynastic Problems 1460-1571* (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1973), and *Early Elizabethan Succession Question*, have extensively covered such matters.

historians may get some evidence about the way in which queens might legitimise their rule. The royal entry had been a great show to display monarchs' legitimacy and triumph since the late medieval period; citing the entries of Henry VI of England into London in 1431 and Charles VIII of France into Rouen in 1485, Roy Strong indicates that "dynasty, sanctity, mystery, virtue, cast within visionary and often apocalyptic terms, provide us with the thought context of the late medieval kingship."¹¹ By the same token, the queens' entries brought about an embodiment of queenship, in particular through functioning as each ruling queen's debut in power. Elizabeth indeed performed impressively in her entry in 1559, constructing and fashioning her rule with various sources which could promote the legitimacy of her rule. The first two sections thus will investigate how differently Elizabeth represented herself in her entry from Mary Tudor, and how she fashioned her royal power in the same event, along with other public speeches in her later reign.

The subsequent two sections are going to study the defence of Elizabeth's rule. With regard to the controversy of the queen's rule in the new reign, most Protestants, facing the new reality of a Protestant Queen, felt obliged to make amends for previous attacks on ruling women typified by Goodman and Knox. In the reign of Elizabeth there hence emerged a larger scale justification for the Queen's political power than during the previous reign. The earliest example is probably *Tract against John Knox's The First Blast of the Trumpet*, written by Richard Bertie,

¹¹ Strong, *Art and Power: Renaissance Festivals 1450-1650* (Woodbridge: the Boydell Press, 1984), 9.

former Marian exile, husband of the Duchess of Suffolk, in 1558-9. This work was written hurriedly and remained as a rough manuscript. Obviously, it was not prepared for circulation, nor is there any evidence that the work was ever presented to Elizabeth.¹² This chapter therefore will skip Bertie's work and focus on the following three tracts. The first is the most famous "mirror-for-queens" in defending the queen's rule in the early reign of Elizabeth—*An Harborowe for Faithfull and Trewe Svbiectes, agaynst the late Blowne Blast, Concerninge the Gouernment of Women* (1559)—written by John Aylmer, a former Protestant exile. Patricia-Ann Lee suggests that there were no other important works written in favour of the rule of women after Aylmer's work.¹³ In fact, this genre of writing did not cease after 1559, and it was not even limited to Protestants. Two noteworthy examples were William Fleetwood's *Itinerarium ad Windsor* (1575) and Henry Howard's (the Earl of Northampton and an ardent Catholic) *A Dutiful Defense of the Lawful Regiment of Women* (1590). Both works were never printed, but well-prepared for circulation. Two copies of each survive in the British Library and Howard's tract also has several other copies preserved in other libraries.¹⁴ This suggests that there was sufficient interest in these two works and they might have

¹² This manuscript is in the British Library, Additional MS 48043. The work was also possible to be written in 1568, see Amanda Shephard, *Gender and Authority in Sixteenth-Century England* (Keele: Ryburn, 1994), 27-30.

¹³ Patricia-Ann Lee, "A Bodye Politique to Governe: Aylmer, Knox and the Debate on Queenship," *The Historian, A Journal of History* 52 (1990), 260.

¹⁴ The manuscripts for Fleetwood's tract can be found in the British Library, Harley MSS. 168 and in Harley MSS. 6234; another copy is in Bodleian Library, Tanner MSS. 84. Howard's tract can be found in several collections of manuscripts. Two of them in the British Library are Lansdowne MSS 813 and Harley MSS. 7201. Other copies of Howard's work are in Houghton fMS. Eng.826, Harvard University; and Newberry Case MS. fJ5452.634, Chicago University. Other copies can be found in Bodleian ms. 903, Oxford University; British Library, Harley MSS 6257, 7021; and one more

reached a group of courtiers and important ministers, although it was doubtful whether the Queen read them or not.

There have been several studies dealing with the defence of woman's rule in sixteenth-century England.¹⁵ Most of them confine their discussion to printed treatises, and very few mention the works of William Fleetwood and Henry Howard. Moreover, none of them notes the surprising fact that there were no such defences for Queen Elizabeth printed in England—Aylmer's treatise was printed in Strasbourg and not directly dedicated to Elizabeth. If "the need for such defences arose at the accession of Elizabeth I,"¹⁶ as Pamela Joseph Benson states, we need to ask why none of the literature of "progynocracy" was sponsored and thereby promoted by the Queen. The answers might be found partly in the fact that Elizabeth herself was not so interested in such defences. She might feel that she did not need any defence of woman's rule as long as she held power equivalent to a king. In addition, it can be explained by the fact that the issue of woman's rule became immensely sensitive in the reign of Elizabeth. As long as the question of succession remained unsettled, any such works defending woman's rule were easily tainted with treasonous attempts

in Pepys Library, Magdalene College, Cambridge University. All references in this chapter are based on the Newberry Case manuscript.

¹⁵ Such studies see Paula Louise Scalingi, "The Scepter or the Distaff: The Question of Female Sovereignty, 1516-1607," *The Historian* 41-1 (1978): 59-75; Mortimer Levine, "The Place of Women in Tudor Government," in *Tudor Rule and Revolution: Essays for G. R. Elton from his American Friends*, eds. Delloyd J. Guth and John W. McKenna (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 109-23; Constance Jordan, "Woman's Rule in Sixteenth-Century British Political Thought," *Renaissance Quarterly*, 40 (1987): 421-51, and her *Renaissance Feminism: Literary Texts and Political Models* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990), 116-33; Pamela Joseph Benson, *The Invention of the Renaissance Woman: the Challenge of Female Independence in the Literature and Thought of Italy and England* (Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992), 231-50; Judith M. Richards, "'To Promote a Woman to Bear Rule': Talking of Queens in Mid-Tudor England," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 28-1(1997): 101-21.

¹⁶ Benson, *The Invention of the Renaissance Woman*, 231.

to promote rival female claimants (particularly Lady Catherine Grey and Mary Stuart) to succeed Elizabeth, even though the writers clearly declared that their works were intended to justify Elizabeth's right. In other words, the Elizabethan government was tremendously cautious about the publication of this kind of writings.

Accordingly, this chapter will first set out to understand the formation of Elizabeth's self-defence for her rule through the ceremonial sources and her own speeches, by a comparison with other ruling queens. Second, it will examine Elizabeth's apologists' defences, in contrast to John Knox's attacks. Finally, it attempts to investigate the anomalies in the printing of those defences and then make a comparison between the Queen's own perception of her rule and the ideas of the writers.

I. The ruling queens' coronation entries

The first and foremost opportunity for legitimating and representing Elizabeth's regal power was the Queen's coronation entry to London in 1559. The royal entry itself was a particular spectacle of power for an early modern monarch, functioning originally to re-legitimise his/her power, "both in terms of his own sanctity, . . . and in those of his descent of the blood royal as the rightful heir of his dynasty," as Roy Strong indicates.¹⁷ The royal entry was also a sensible form of dialogue between the ruler and the city; or in other words, a vehicle for exchange between the new

¹⁷ Strong, *Art and Power*, 8.

governor and a group of citizens, involving the exchanges of political power, military support, and urban economy.¹⁸ However, a ruling queen's entry carried more signification. It essentially contained a gender transfer of symbols and rituals which once had used to apply to kings' power. It could also become the ideal mechanism for a queen to legitimise her female body in political power, given that woman's rule was perceived unnatural in early modern Europe. In a sense, the ruling queen's coronation entry was more dynamic and functional than the king's.

The entry of the first Renaissance ruling queen, Isabella of Castile, was a vivid example of how a queen could legitimise and energise her power through it, and served as one of a limited number of precedents for Queen Mary and Queen Elizabeth. Isabella had claimed herself to be the heir of Henry IV, King of Castile, in 1468, but she could not claim rights to the throne until Henry's death on 12 December 1474. No sooner did she learn of the King's death than she began sending letters to the realm and called together her council. A decision was quickly made that the Queen would make her entry at Segovia and be crowned there on the next day, although her husband Ferdinand of Aragon was off in Zaragoza assisting his father at this moment. On the day, 13 December 1474, magnificent ceremonies were held for Isabella's coronation, for which preparation must have proceeded at a

¹⁸ Jennifer Loach is convinced that these ceremonies relating to the monarch's coronation entry were primarily intended to "bind together the ruler and his most important subjects"—the clergy and the nobility; "indeed service on such occasions was one of the ways in which noble status was recognized." Jennifer Loach, "The Function of Ceremonial in the Reign of Henry VIII," *Past and Present* 142 (1994): 43-68. The coronation entry is also viewed as a kind of "gendered exchanges" by Susan Frye in her study of Elizabeth's coronation entry. See her *Elizabeth I: the Competition for Representation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), chapter one.

frantic pace. She mounted on a white horse which was richly dressed with jewellery of gold and precious stones, and she was brought under a richly brocaded canopy marching from the castle to the plaza major of Segovia where a platform was erected for the principal ceremony of the day.¹⁹

The first figurative scene of Isabella's entry was the mutual promise made between the Queen and the grandees of the city. Isabella in the ceremony swore that she would honour the Church, "look to the common good of the realm and to the good of its royal crown, and do her utmost to aggrandise those kingdoms and maintain her subjects in justice," and more significantly, "she would not pervert but would guard the privileges and liberties and exemptions of the *hidalgos*—the nobles, and of the municipalities," as all her progenitors had done.²⁰ Swearing in the masculine language of a protector as a king, Isabella affiliated her female body to the role of a ruler, the traditionally masculine position. Then in turn, the clergy, the nobles and the knights and her councillors, followed by town nobles, knelt before the Queen and took an oath of loyalty and obedience to her. The keepers of the fortresses then gave Queen the keys of the *alcázar* which contained Henry IV's treasury. Through this form of political and economic exchange on a public stage, Isabella impressively affirmed her status as the lawful and rightful heir of the dead king.

¹⁹ Warren Hasty Carroll, *Isabel of Spain: the Catholic Queen* (New York: Christendom Press, 1991), 73-75; Peggy K. Liss, *Isabel the Queen: Life and Times* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 96-99.

²⁰ Cited from Liss, *Isabel the Queen*, 97.

Another stunning scene appeared in the procession after a loud proclamation by a herald and the cheers of the crowd.²¹ The Queen rode to the cathedral, surrounded by nobles on foot and followed by city's dignitaries. Ahead of everyone rode the most significant Segovian, Gutierre de Cárdenas, carrying a naked sword, pointing straight up to the sky. The sword was the ancient sign of the reigning monarch's sovereignty and justice, "an archtypical masculine symbol."²² Isabella's consort, Ferdinand, was greatly irritated by the news of his wife's "self-coronation" and much more angered with the demonstration of the sword. His party reproached the Queen who had usurped this masculine attribute since there was no precedent for a queen to be proceeded by this symbol, customarily conceded to kings alone. The novelty of utilising the naked sword for a queen also drew sharp comments from Isabella's own nobles, and, according to the records of Alonso de Palencia, people were muttering that a king's will was being subordinated to a queen's when the sword emerged from the Queen's procession.²³ None the less, Isabella was successfully raised to the throne and displayed in full public view that the inheritance of the kingdom exclusively belonged to the Queen, not to Ferdinand, which could justify her action and win her overwhelming patriotic support.

²¹ The proclamation was a customarily cry for the coronation of Castile's monarchs. The herald cried out for Isabella: "*Casilla, Castille, Castille, por la reyna a señora nuestra, la reyna doña Isabel, e por el rey don Fernando, como su legitimo marido!*" Significantly, it was a public acknowledgement of Isabella's superior and absolute power, and expressed that her husband, Ferdinand, was no more than a king-consort. See Marvin Lunenfeld, "Isabella I of Castile and the Company of Women in Power," *Historical Reflections* 4-2 (1977): 212-13.

²² Ibid.

²³ See Liss, *Isabel the Queen*, 97-98.

Taken as a whole, the fact that Isabella took the crown alone and made use of the sword was a significant metaphor for her superiority to Ferdinand in political power. Ferdinand, in a way, was symbolically marginalised from the power centre of Castile, although Isabella desperately needed him in the war. Isabella thus legitimated a woman's rule through ancient masculine and kingly ritual, which granted her rule the same authority as that of a king. Her action, historically, made a precedent for other ruling queens in their joint rule with foreign princes.

About eighty years after Isabella's entry, her granddaughter Mary Tudor was raised to the throne. Mary Tudor's coronation entry was enormously noteworthy since she was the first woman crowned in a ceremony customary for an English king. Mary made her first entry on 3 August 1553 to take possession of her kingdom. This was a spectacular and unprecedented display of her royal power. Spanish ambassadors reported that "the joy of the people is hardly credible, Sire, and the public demonstrations made at the entry have never had their equal in this kingdom. . . . Her look, her manner, her gestures, her countenance was such that in no event could they have been improved."²⁴ This was also a moment of triumph as it was reported that her old enemies, the Duke of Norfolk, Courtney, the Bishop of Winchester, Stephen Gardiner, and the widow of the late Protector and Lady Anne Somerset, all met the Queen at the Tower gate and knelt down saluting Queen Mary. Mary came to kiss them and said, "theis are my prisoners."²⁵

²⁴ The Ambassadors to the Emperor, 6 August 1553, *CSP Sp.*, XI, 151.

²⁵ *Queen Jane and Queen Mary*, 14.

In the procession of her first entry, Mary was dressed in a gown of purple velvet, with precious jewellery on her neck, and her skirts and sleeves embroidered in gold. She rode on a horse which was richly decorated with gold and was accompanied by the king's trumpeters and sergeants at arms, preceding by over seven hundred nobles, knights, and ambassadors. The Earl of Arundel rode just before her and carried the sword, and next to the Earl, the Mayor of London bore the mace in his hand; both objects symbolised English sovereignty. Then, Mary was followed by about one hundred and eighty ladies and gentlemen, led by Elizabeth Tudor to Aldgate.²⁶ A significant stage was arranged for the entry:

that a scaffolding was erected at the town gate, where about one hundred poor little children were placed, all dressed in blue, with red caps upon their heads. They were given to the Queen to nourish and care for them, the eldest not being over twelve or fourteen. One of them addressed a prayer to her Majesty that she might take them under her care.²⁷

However, Mary "sayd nothings to them," according to a record.²⁸ Her speechlessness lost the new ruler an unparalleled opportunity to present a queen's care and mercy for her subjects, one that Queen Elizabeth would perform ostentatiously for her own entry. Mary's silence lost a valuable chance to perform a form of exchange between the Queen and the citizens. It also revealed her deficient awareness of self-fashioning for her power in this spectacle.

²⁶ Ibid. Also see Charles Wriothesley, *A Chronicle of England during the Reigns of the Tudors from 1485 to 1559*, ed. W. D. Hamilton (London: Camden Society, 1877), I. 93; *The Diary of Henry Machyn, citizen and merchant-taylor of London*, ed. J. G. Nichols (London: Camden Society, 42, 1848), 38-39.

²⁷ *CSP Sp.*, XI, 151.

²⁸ *Queen Jane and Queen Mary*, 14. In the report of Spanish ambassadors, they only indicated that this event was the custom in England at the royal entries, but omitted the Queen's reaction to those children.

More than one month later, Queen Mary made her coronation entry, followed by a procession, on 30 September. On the day, the windows and walls on both sides of the streets were hung with splendid tapestries, arrays, cloth of gold and tissue, garnished with streamers and banners, and several pageants and devices were deliberately arranged. The Spanish ambassadors stressed again that the procession was “a memorable and solemn one, undisturbed by any noise or tumult and to every one’s liking,” and the pomp and ceremonies were “far grander than elsewhere.”²⁹ Mary and her government evidently realised that they needed to make the most use of this occasion to present the Queen as a powerful monarch with all the panoply of royal sovereignty as all her progenitors had done.

Mary on this occasion was dressed “with a mantle and kirtle of cloth of gold, furred with miniver and powdered ermines, on her head a circlet of gold set with stones and pearls,”³⁰ carried in an open litter covered with brocade and garnished with white cloth of gold, marching in the procession. Before the Queen rode Spanish, French, Venetian and Hanse towns’ ambassadors with English nobles, gentlemen, and officers. Two coaches followed her, the first of which was led by

²⁹ The ambassadors to the Emperor, 30 September, 1553, *CSP Sp.*, XI, 259; Simon Renard to Prince Philip, 3 October 1553, *CSP Sp.*, XI, 262.

³⁰ *CSP, Domestic Series of the Reign of Mary I, 1553-1558* (London: Public Record Office, 1998), 10. This official record does not give any hint about the colour of Mary’s dress. However, another contemporary record indicates that Mary “sat in a gown of blew velvet, furred with powdered armyen, hangyng on hir heade a call of clothe of tynsell besett with perle and ston,” in a similar dress of kings. See *Queen Jane and Queen Mary*, 28. This record is adopted both in John Stow’s and Raphael Holinshed’s *Chronicles*. But Judith M. Richards believes that “Mary in fact chose to pass through the streets of London to her coronation dressed as queens usually dressed, in white and with her hair loose— symbols of purity and fertility which had long been displayed by queens consort on such occasions,” in her “Mary Tudor a ‘Sole Quene’? Gendering Tudor Monarchy,” *The Historical Journal* 40-4 (1997): 901. Her suggestion of Mary’s dress is indeed based on little evidence.

Elizabeth, all dressed in rich garments. As was customary for English monarchs' entries, the sword carried by the Earl of Arundel emerged from the procession, viewed by an audience in the city of London. The new Queen was thus presented as a powerful monarch in the pomp and ceremony of preceding English male monarchs. Unlike Isabella's entry, the use of the sword did not encounter any criticism in the realm or from other countries, probably because Mary was still the sole ruler of the kingdom and all the ceremonies were arranged "accordynge to the precedentes."³¹

About eight pageants constituted the procession, although little is known about the contents and themes of these pageants, and much less found its way into any special publication for this event. We are only sure that "the efforts of the native Londoners were eclipsed by those of the 'straungers' whose three pageants 'wer the myghtyest'."³² Hence, the main pageants were works of the foreign communities in London. According to John Stow's *Chronicles of England*, a foreign commentator sums up the shows in the comment that "on the streets were several arches, but only two of them worth noticing, one by the Genoese, the other by the Florentines."³³ The lack of a native discourse of English pageantry, to a great degree, diminished Mary's status as a ruler of Englishmen. Likewise, there are not any records showing that Queen Mary delivered any important speeches, or any meaningful gestures.

³¹ *The Manner of the Coronacion of the late Quene Mary*, British Library, Royal App. 89, f.95.

³² Sydney Anglo, *Spectacle, Pageantry, and Early Tudor Policy* (Oxford: the Clarendon Press, 1969), 319. The three most magnificent pageants were conducted by Genoese merchants resident in London, the Esterlings (Hanseatic merchants), and the Florentines. For these three and other pageants see *Queen Jane and Queen Mary*, 29-30; *The Diary of Henry Machyn*, 45.

³³ John Stow, *The Chronicles of England, from Brute vnto this Present year 1580* (London: H. Bynneman F., 1580, STC 2333), 616.

Only when the city gave one thousand marks in gold, “the Queen gave thanks.”³⁴ Giving a gift of gold from the city to the ruler was a highly symbolic ritual in monarchs' entries that conveyed a fundamental exchange of financial support from the city and political and economic protection from the Crown—a mutual reliance. Hence, Mary's silence or limited reaction certainly gave away a crucial chance to define her new regime. On the whole, Mary's government missed a propaganda opportunity to legitimate and aggrandise the first female monarchy, through the double failures of Mary's self-fashioning and official publication for this glorious event.

II. Elizabeth's “Entry” of Power

Both Queen Isabella and Mary utilised the old ceremonies for male rulers to ritualise their sovereignty; Queen Elizabeth followed the same route as they had gone and her coronation entry generally observed the forms of Mary's. Nevertheless, Queen Elizabeth's entry was quite different from Mary's in three aspects. First, the proceedings of 14 January 1559, Queen Elizabeth's entry to the city of London, were not only recorded by diverse people, but also published in detail in *The Quenes Maiesties Passage through the Citie of London to Westimnster* (23 January, 1559), written by Richard Mulcaster. This pamphlet gives us a detailed description of the

³⁴ CSP, *Domestic Series*, 10. But the record of *The Chronicle of Queen Jane and Queen Mary* shows that Mary only gratefully received the money without saying anything: “At the lyttell condyt ther was another pageant, wheron stoode certayn children in women's apparell, and after a certayn oracion and salutacion ther was geven the quene, by one of the children, for the cyty, in a goodly purse a thousande li. which she most thankfully receyved.” *Queen Jane and Queen Mary*, 29-30.

event, and shows that the pageants of 1559 “were certainly the best proportioned, and most coherent, cogent, and apposite series to have been presented in London ” since 1552.³⁵ This pamphlet was either directed and approved by the Queen herself as J. E. Neale believes or supervised by the Aldermen of London as Susan Frye suggests. Whatever its origin, the text was indeed invaluable propaganda for Elizabeth's new regime.³⁶ Secondly, in marked contrast to Mary's procession, the pageants were wholly constructed by native English people, primarily sponsored by London merchants, and the themes were distinctly English/Protestant. Whereas Mary's procession was magnificent for the donations of “strangers,” the author of *The Quenes Maiesties Passage* noticed that “the Queenes hyghnesse passed through the citie, whiche without anye forreyne persone, or it selfe beautified it selfe.”³⁷ That expressed the citizens' rejection of the old foreign-tuned regime and old religion, and moreover, it manifested a sense of English nationhood. Thirdly, more relevant to our theme, Queen Elizabeth played her role as a monarch in this event more impressively and figuratively than Queen Mary. As John Hayward commented in his *Annals*, “the Queene was not negligent on her part to descend to all pleasing behaviour.”³⁸ She exploited this chance to represent her legitimacy and sovereignty, which made her entry more dynamic and theatrical; “so that if a man should say well, he could not better term the citie of London that time, than a stage wherein was

³⁵ Anglo, *Spectacle*, 347.

³⁶ J. E. Neale, “Introduction,” in *The Quenes Maiesties Passage through the Citie of London to Westminster the Day before her Coronation*, ed. James M. Osborn (New Haven, Yale University Press, published for the Elizabethan Club, 1960), 15. Frye, *Elizabeth I*, 30-31.

³⁷ *The Quenes Maiesties Passage*, sig. E2v.

shewed the wonderfull spectacle, of a noble hearted princesse toward her most louing people, a[nd] the peoples excading comfort in beholding so worthy a soueraign."³⁹

The first smart action that Elizabeth attempted to take was to define the foundation of her power as divinely ordained on any suitable occasions, even before the entry began to proceed. Her first performance came when Elizabeth moved into the Tower on the day before her coronation entry, accompanied by the Lord Mayor and the Aldermen, with other barges bearing streamers and banners of arms.⁴⁰

Elizabeth soon made a speech as she entered into the Tower,

Some have fallen from being Princes of this land, to be prisoners in this place; I am rayased from beeing prisoner in this place, to bee Prince of this land. That dejectione was a worke of God's justice; this advancement is a worke of his mercy; as they were to yeeld patience for the one, so I must beare my selfe towards God thankfull, and to men mercifull and beneficiall for the other.⁴¹

This speech, referring to her own experience of imprisonment in the Tower in the reign of Mary Tudor, vividly portrayed the miraculous scene of the weak turning to be the powerful, due to God's grateful grace.⁴²

³⁸ John Hayward, *Annals of the Four years of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* (London: Camden Society, 1840), 16.

³⁹ *The Quenes Maiesties Passage*, sig. A2v.

⁴⁰ *The Diary of Henry Machyn*, 186.

⁴¹ Hayward, *Annals*, 10-11.

⁴² Elizabeth was put into prison during the spring of 1554 to 1555 because she was suspected to involved in Thomas Wyatt's rebellion of 1554. Although there was not sufficient evidence for a conviction except a letter written to her from Wyatt, Queen Mary decided to keep a close watch on her sister's action and finally sent her into the Tower on 18 March 1554. When less evidence was found against Elizabeth, she was released to Woodstock in May, but was kept under close house arrest until April 1555. For the history of Elizabeth's imprisonment see *The Diary of Henry Machyn*, 51-60; *Queen Jane and Queen Mary*, 70-76; Wriothsley, *A Chronicle*, 106-17; Foxe, VIII, 600-25, which is reprinted in E. Arber, *An English Garner, Tudor Tracts, 1532-1588*. vol. XIII (London: Archibald Constable and Co., Ltd., 1877-96), 333-64; David Loades, *Mary Tudor: A Life* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989), 208-22, 283-93; J. E. Neale, *Queen Elizabeth* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1938), 43-49; Paul Johnson, *Elizabeth I: A Study in Power and Intellect* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1974), 44-48; MacCaffrey, *Elizabeth I*, 16-22.

In contrast with Mary's triumphant saying that "theis are my prisoners" towards her old enemies at the Tower gate on the day of her first entry, Elizabeth portrayed herself as the prisoner, which however seemed to generate deeper veneration and affection. The misery of the past and the glory of the present tactically reiterated on the day of entry when Elizabeth moved from the Tower to Westminster preparing for her coronation entry, she prayed in the Tower, "lifted vp her eyes to heauen" and said:

O Lord, almighty and euerlasting God, I geue thee most heartie thanks that thou hast been so mercifull vnto me as to spare me to beholde this ioyfull Daye. And I acknowledge that thou hast dealt as wonderfully a[nd] as mercifully with me as thou didst wyth thy true and faithfull seruant Daniel thy prophete whom thou deliueredst out of the Denne from the crueltie of the gredy and rageing Lyons: euen so was I ouerwhelmed, and only by thee deliuered. To thee therfore only be thanks, honor, a[nd] prayse, for euer. Amen."⁴³

Elizabeth compared herself in the prayer to God's beloved Daniel, and her release from the Tower (a confinement by Mary Tudor's power) to Daniel's from the den of lions (Daniel 6:19-23). Here Elizabeth certainly attempted to convey a strong message by this prayer that her ascension was out of God's favour and assistance and therefore her reign was appointed by God's ordinance—a mark of the legitimacy of her sovereignty.

Moreover, the same story of the Queen's deliverance technically implied that the Queen's female body was also liberated by God from natural or conventional confinement to be capable of rule. This idea was enhanced by Elizabeth herself in

⁴³ *The Quenes Maiesties Passage*, sig. E4.

her accession speech in the parliament of 1559, regarding the burden of governing which God has ordained to her:

My Lords the Law of Nature moveth mee to sorrowe for my Sister, the burthen that is fallen upon me maketh me amazed, and yet considering I am Gods Creature, ordeyned to obey his appointment I wil thereto Yelde, desiringe from the bottom of my harte that I may have assistance of his Grace to bee the minister of his Heavenly Will in this office now commytted to me, and as I am but one Bodye naturallie Considered though by his permission a Bodye Politique to Governe, so I shall desyre you all my Lords . . . to be assistant to me,⁴⁴

Elizabeth in this speech employed the significant idea of the queen's two bodies, suggesting that even though she had the same "Bodye naturallie" of the female sex as her sister or other women, nevertheless, through God's special permission, she had a "Bodye Politique"—a clear identity of sovereignty — to rule the country.

Another striking effect of retelling the story was that Elizabeth reminded the audience of the danger and suffering of her imprisonment. That misery was marvellously transformed as an image of her suffering under the oppression of the old regime and old religion, and of her sacrifice for the English people against foreign infiltration. Her desolation therefore could have the effect of invoking in the crowd a feeling of admiration and devotion towards her. Many modern politicians in East Europe and Asia who once were tortured or oppressed by former regimes usually gain and enhance their positions in the new government through renewing people's memory of their sacrifice. By the same token, Elizabeth's suffering in the past became the valuable asset for present politics.

⁴⁴ British Library, Stow MSS 363, f.1. Also see Allison Heisch, "Queen Elizabeth I: Parliamentary Rhetoric and the Exercise of Power," *Sign* 1-1 (1975): 33.

Apparently, Elizabeth was aware of the multiple advantages of the story of her imprisonment. She recapitulated it sometimes in the following years of her reign. For instance, she recalled the moment of her affliction in an answer to a delegation from Parliament in 1566 that "there were occacions in me at that tyme. I stode in dangere of my lyffe, my systere was so ensent ageynst me: I dyd dyffere from here in relygeon, and I was sowght for dyverse wayes."⁴⁵ It is interesting to note here that Elizabeth represented her imprisonment as purely a religious torment, nothing to do with any political conspiracy, perhaps in order to accentuate her faith in Protestantism. Again, Elizabeth treated her deliverance from the Tower as a miracle by God's favour in her speech to a petition in 1586:

so many and so great are the unmeasurable graces and benefits bestowed upon me by the Almighty that I must not only most humbly acknowledge them as benefits, but admire them as miracles, being in no sort able to express them. . . . none alive can more justly acknowledge himself bound to God than I, whose life he hath miraculously preserved from so many dangers.⁴⁶

Obviously, she repeated in this speech the idea that God preserved her for the coronation and the new reign.

Returning to Elizabeth's coronation entry itself, legitimisation was the theme of the opening pageant of the procession. The first pageant came in the upper end of Gracechurch street after Elizabeth was formally greeted at Fenchurch, which ushered in another seven pageants. There were three stages or degrees in this pageant. Upon the lowest stage there were placed two personages representing King Henry VII

⁴⁵ *Parliaments*, I, 147.

⁴⁶ George P. Rice ed., *The Public Speaking of Queen Elizabeth* (New York: AMS Press, 1966), 88

and his wife, Elizabeth of York, daughter of King Edward IV. They were enclosed in a red rose and a white rose respectively, the former symbolising the House of Lancaster and the latter the House of York. On the second stage were set Henry VIII and “by him sate one representing y^e right worthie ladie quene Anne, wife to the said king Henrie theyght, a[nd] mother to our most soueraign ladie quene Elizabeth that now is;” and on the uppermost stage was Queen Elizabeth. The whole pageant was garnished with red and white roses and furnished with sentences concerning unity.⁴⁷

Then a child's oration followed to signify the theme of this pageant as peace and concord by “the uniting of the two houses of York and Lancaster.”⁴⁸ This pageant celebrated the dynastic glory by the parallel between Elizabeth of York and the new Elizabeth, however, it displayed much more about the Queen's hereditary right from the blood of both houses, Lancaster and York, than the theme the city intended to address. Neither Edward VI nor Mary I figured in this pageant, Elizabeth was consequently represented as the most direct and lawful heir to English Crown. The scene which was exhibited in a public view imported a more powerful sign of the Queen's legitimacy than any word the Queen could say. Elizabeth undoubtedly enjoyed it with fair thankfulness.⁴⁹

⁴⁷ *The Quenes Maiesties Passage*, sig. A4-B1. The display of red and white roses had been used in Elizabeth's mother, Queen Anne's coronation entry, see “The Coronation of Anne Boleyn,” printed in Arber, *An English Garner*, 9-28, esp. 15.

⁴⁸ *The Quenes Maiesties Passage*, sig. B1r.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, sig. B1v.

Like Mary Tudor, Elizabeth's effort to affirm her legitimacy to succeed to the throne was manifested in the first Parliament of her reign in early 1559. This parliament put forward Henry VIII's Third Succession Act (1544) and his will (1546) as law, which was the first evidence of the constitutionality of Henry's Succession Acts and will as Mortimer Levine indicates.⁵⁰ "The Act of Recognition of the Queen's Highness' Title" of 1599 declared that Elizabeth was "rightly, lineally, and lawfully descended and come of the blood royal of this realm of England," grounded in "an act concerning the establishment of the King's Majesty's Succession" by Henry VIII.⁵¹ Nevertheless, Elizabeth did not go as far as Mary Tudor and pass an act declaring the marriage between her mother and King Henry valid, thereby proclaiming herself to be born in lawful matrimony.⁵² Nor did the Act of 1559 repeal all the previous acts declaring Elizabeth a bastard or the marriage unlawful.

It seemed that Elizabeth was not as anxious as Mary regarding her legitimacy in hereditary perspective (or she was simply more tactful than Mary had been). On the other hand, Elizabeth's self-representation showed that she was more and more interested in defining the foundation of her power from other sources: God's favour being one, and subjects' love another, as her reign progressed. The author of *The Passage* highlighted people's earnest love towards Elizabeth in the beginning of this pamphlet and stressed that Queen Elizabeth always showed herself "no lesse

⁵⁰ Levine, *The Early Elizabethan Succession Question*, 150.

⁵¹ *Statutes of the Realm*, IV, 1, Elizabeth I, c3. 358-59.

⁵² Nevertheless, Elizabeth's first Parliament passed an act concerning Queen Anne to declare that Queen Elizabeth was restored in blood to Queen Anne her mother. See *Statutes of the Realm*, IV, 1 Elizabeth, c23, 397.

thankfullie to receiue her peoples good wille, than they louingly offred it unto her.”⁵³

This exchange of love between the people and the Queen succeeded and culminated in another ceremony in the high end of Cheapside. There the City gave a gift of one thousand marks in gold, put “in a purse of crimson satin, richly wrought with gold,” to the Queen, by the Recorder of the City. The Lord Mayor declared “their gladnes and good wille towards the Queens maiestie, . . . desyering her grace to continue their good and gracious Quene, and not to esteme the value of the gift, but the mynd of the geuers.”⁵⁴ This ceremony not only displayed a form of financial exchange, but also a chance to demonstrate the mutual good will and love between the Queen and the City. Elizabeth made an affectionate speech in return:

I thanke my lord maior, his brethrn, a[nd] you all. And wheras your request is that I should continue your good ladie a[nd] quene, be ye ensured, that I will be as good vnto you as euer quene was to her people. No wille in me can lacke, neither Doe I trust shall ther lacke any power, And perswade your selues, that for the safette and quietnes of you all, I will not spare, if nede be to spend my blood, God thanke you all.”⁵⁵

Elizabeth conducted her speech in the language of gratitude and self-sacrifice —“I will not spare, if nede be to spend my blood”— for the public good. While her words touched people's hearts, raising “a marvellous shout and rejoicing,” she was winning her royal power the affectionate support of the people.

⁵³ *The Quenes Maiesties Passage*, sig. A2r.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, sig. C3v.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

Elizabeth had expressed the idea that her power had originated from the people's desire as early as 1558. When the Spanish ambassador De Feria told her that she owed her crown to his master, King Philip, Elizabeth reprimanded him saying "it is the people who have placed me in the position I at present hold as the declared successor to the Crown."⁵⁶ Elizabeth brought out the theme of people's love again in her speech in 1586. She told people that she was most deeply bound to thank God for one thing, which she termed as a "miracle," that "as I came to the crown with the hearty good will of all my subjects, so now after twenty-eight years' reign, I perceive in them the same if not greater affection towards me, which should I once lose, I might perhaps find myself to breathe but never could I think that I were alive."⁵⁷ Basically, Elizabeth expressed that the people's affection was indispensable to her life, and certainly, her power. However, it is rather unlikely that Elizabeth sincerely had the idea that monarchs' regal power derived from their subjects. Nevertheless, her fashioning of her power to look as though it originated from the people's will could effectively add her legitimacy to the throne with a wider support, which implied that anyone against her rule was against the English people.

Elizabeth, through her whole reign, was keen on building her rule on the basis of popular affection towards herself, and moreover, intentionally emphasised a mutual love between the people and the Queen. Therefore, she declared from time to time that, in return for the people's love, she would treat the people's safety and

⁵⁶ Frederick Chamberlin ed., *The Sayings of Queen Elizabeth* (London: John Lane the Bodley Head Ltd., 1923), 11.

⁵⁷ *The Public Speaking of Queen Elizabeth*, 88.

prosperity as her most important princely duty. She perfectly restated this idea in her parliament speech in 1601, which is the so-called "Golden Speech"⁵⁸:

I doe assuer yow ther is noe prynce that loveth his subiectes better or whose love can counterveyle our love. Ther is noe jewell be it of never soe riche a pryce which I sett before this jewell, I meane your love; ffor I doe more esteeme yt then anye treasure or riches, And thoughe God hath raysed me highe, yet this I counte the glorye of my crowne, that I have reigned with your loves. This makes me that I doe not soe muche reioyce that God hath mede me to be a queene, as to be a queene over soe thanckeful a people. Therefore I have cause to wishe nothinge more then to contente the subiecte, and that is a dutye which I owe; neyther doe I desier to lyve longer dayes then that I maye see your prosperitie, and that's my onlye desier.

Elizabeth repeatedly stressed, in this speech, that although God preserved her for the Crown, it was people's love and desire of her to make her reign more valuable and treasurable. For reciprocation, the Queen stated that she always treated her subjects' good before all other "worldlye goodes."⁵⁹ Hence, she declared that she would willingly sacrifice her own life, and "there will never queene sitt in my seate with more zeale to my cuntrye, care to my subiectes, and that will sooner with

⁵⁸ There are at least four versions of "Golden Speech," stated by Elizabeth in her tenth parliament in December 1601. According to E. Allison Heisch's category, these distinct four versions include: first, "text as first printed in 1601" which can be found in *STC* 7578, Lansdowne MSs 94, f.123; second, "Townshend text," which is collected in British Library. Stow MSS 362, ff.169-72, British Library, Egerton MSS 2223, ff.250-1 and Townshend's *Historical Collections*, 263-66; third, "later printed text," which is in *STC* 7579, British Library, Harley MSS 169, f.45, and British Library, Harley MSS 6056, ff.43-5; fourth, "anonymous report" which is showed in British Library, Harley MSS 787, ff.127-28 and British Library, Harley MSS 4808, ff.221-32. See her *The Parliamentary Addresses of Queen Elizabeth I* (PhD. Dissertation, Harvard University, 1977), 364-65. It appears little difficulty in believing that two printed texts are authentic because undoubtedly Elizabeth sanctioned its publication. As for other versions, T. E. Hartley suggests that they are also believed to be "authentic," and all can "represent the substance of what the Queen said on the day, though their variations arise from the differing abilities of individuals to record fully and accurately what they heard." See his *Parliaments*, III, 249-45. Here I use the first one in Harley MSS 787 and Stow MSS 362.

⁵⁹ British Library, Stow MSS 362. f.169. Also see Heisch, "Queen Elizabeth I: Parliamentary Rhetoric and the Exercise of Power," 40-41.

willingnes ventuer her lyfe ffor your good and safety, then my selfe, . . .”⁶⁰

Additionally, another version of the “Golden Speech” showed that Elizabeth tactically wove the theme of her deliverance by God’s favour in the same speech:

that God hath sett me over you, and preserved me soe miraculously from dishonour, shame, oppression, violence and infinite dangers and practises attempted by the enemyes of God and religion against me. For which soe mighty deliverance I yeeld all humble and harty thanks to allmighty God.⁶¹

On the whole, as showed in both her coronation entry in 1559 and her own speeches, Elizabeth purposely in her life defined the basis of her power in three aspects: the hereditary succession right, God’s ordinance and the people’s love. The latter two, in particular, became more important as her reign progressed. Elizabeth consequently drew support from two sources, one descending from God, the other ascending from the people, and promised to realise God’s grace on earth by promoting her people’s welfare. Moreover, Elizabeth’s self-representation in her entry also demonstrated that she had a much stronger awareness of fashioning herself and her royal power than Mary Tudor demonstrated in her entry. The queen’s entry and its pageants thus became not only an occasion for the City to address the ruler with any virtue and duty he/she had to be committed to, but also offered invaluable potential for the ruling queen to legitimate her rule from various symbolic dimensions. Although there is some truth in the argument that Elizabeth in her entry distinctly complied with the City’s expectation, in terms of her gender and

⁶⁰ British Library, Stow MSS 362, f.169.

⁶¹ British Library, Harley MSS 787, f. 127v.

finance, as Susan Frye stresses, nevertheless, Elizabeth also gained substantial advantage for her sovereignty in this event.

III. The Protestant defence of the queen's rule

Elizabeth's coronation entry and its pageants, predominantly Protestant-oriented, meant not only to represent a new reign but also a new era of Protestantism. The City laid the Protestant theme to exhort the Queen to promote a new religious age by her virtue and policy in several occasions.⁶² Particularly, in the fourth pageant at the Little Conduit in Cheapside, there took place the delivery of an English Bible from the City, represented by a child who symbolised the goddess *Truth*, to the Queen. Elizabeth accepted the Bible graciously and "thanked the citie for that gift, and sayd that she would oftentimes reade ouer that booke." By means of her own word, Elizabeth successfully demonstrated to the audience her virtue of piety and her English heart. The scene also demonstrated again what we mentioned before: the reciprocation between the City and the Queen.

The City then turned to defend the woman's rule for Queen Elizabeth in the fifth pageant at the Conduit in Fleet Street. In this pageant, a stage was erected and on it placed a royal seat. On the seat, it "placed a semelie and mete personage richlie apparelled in parliament robes, with a sceptre in her hand, as a Quene, crowned with an open crowne, whose name and title was in a table fixed ouer head, in this sort:

⁶² Anglo, *Spectacle*, 358.

Debora the iudge and restorer of the house of Israel . . . Debora with her estates. consulting for the good gouernment of Israel."⁶³ The device of Deborah (Judges 4-5) comparing Elizabeth to this female Judge of Israel contained multiple implications. First of all, the City reminded the Queen of the necessity to accept the advice of nobles and gentlemen for her government, as the pamphlet stated that "she might by this be put in remembrance to consult for the worthie gouernment of her people, considering god oftymes sent women nobly to rule among men, as Deborah which gouerned Israell in peace the space of xi yeres."⁶⁴ Second, the comparison of Elizabeth to Deborah simultaneously expressed a comparison of England to Israel, English people to God's chosen people, and therefore the city of London was the new Jerusalem. Those connections together expressed an overtly Protestant and national sense of glory and grace. Finally, this pageant set a precedent of female rule to defend the woman's rule. Richard Grafton, who took part in writing the coronation entry's devices, indicates in his *Abridgement of the Chronicles of England* that this device was arranged to encourage the Queen not to fear, "though she were a woman: for women by the spirite and power of Almyghtye God haue ruled both honourably and pollitiquely, and that a great tyme, as did Debora."⁶⁵ The *Quenes Maiesties Passsage* further stressed that Deborah was chosen and then aided by God:

In war she, through gods aide, did put her foes to flight,
And with the dint of sworde the bande of bondage brast;
In peace she, through gods aide, did alway mainteinge right

⁶³ *The Quenes Maiesties Passage*, sig. D3r-v.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, sig. D4r.

⁶⁵ Richard Grafton, *An Abridgement of the Chronicles of England* (London, 1576), f. 195v.

And iudged Israell till fourty yeres were past.⁶⁶

It strongly suggested that Elizabeth's succession to the throne was similarly chosen by God and her rule would be assisted by God to be long and peaceful.

The usage of Deborah intriguingly corresponded with John Knox's Deborah in his *First Blast*, published a year before Elizabeth's entry. Although Knox admires the same prophetess, he declares that a particular example cannot establish a common law. He rejects the argument that "Debora did rule in Israel, and Hulda spoke prophecie in Juda: *Ergo*, It is lafull for Women to reigne above realmes and nations, or to teache in the presence of men." He considers this argument vain and "of none effect," because by examples "we may establishe no lawe."⁶⁷ Moreover, Knox argues that, even though Deborah ruled Israel and brought her people out of affliction, she had never "usurped authoritie above any realme or nation" by reason of birth and blood, neither did she speak as kings and princes to her subjects, but as she "had a speciall revelation from God."⁶⁸ Therefore, Knox declares that women can have acceptable (not lawful) privilege and authority only when God miraculously raised them as he did to Deborah, nevertheless, particular examples in the history never make laws, for the only written law was Scripture which evidently prohibited women from being rulers. A woman's rule is thus still generally "a monstre in nature" and repugnant to God's Word.⁶⁹ Although Knox's pamphlet means

⁶⁶ *The Quenes Maiesties Passage*, sig. A3v.

⁶⁷ John Knox, *The First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regiment of Women*, in *The Works of John Knox*, VI, 403.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 405, 407.

⁶⁹ Knox wrote that "to promote a Woman to beare rule, superioritie, dominion, or empire above any Realme, Nation, or Citie, is repugnant to Nature; contumelie to God, a thing most contrarious to his

specifically to resist Mary Tudor's rule, he tolerates no exception. By this reasoning, not only is Mary Tudor's rule unlawful, but also Elizabeth, who had proclaimed the same sovereignty by her right and inheritance, violates nature and divine order too.

Knox insisted on his basic ideology even after Elizabeth's accession. In his letter to Elizabeth in 1559, he claims that his book touches nothing about Queen Elizabeth personally or the liberty of England, and states that "I can not deny the wreiting of a booke aganis the usurped Authoritie, and injust Regement of Women; neither [yit] am I myndit to retract or call back any principall point, or propositioun of the same, till treuth and verritie do farder appeir."⁷⁰ Apparently, he does not want to modify his principal opinion about the woman's rule. He is only willing to redefine his idea that as long as Elizabeth's authority is grounded in God's favour in order to "the manifestatioun of his glorie, and extirpatioun of idolatrie," Elizabeth's rule would be deeply desired by himself. Furthermore, as long as the Queen is "nott found ungrate unto God," he declared that "nothing in my booke contained, is, nor can be prejudiciall to your Grace's just regiment."⁷¹ Knox in this letter deliberately evades his bitter detraction of women's weak and malicious nature which had been displayed in his *First Blast*, and moves the focus to religion and obedience to God. Nevertheless, he still stresses in this letter, as well as in his summary of the proposed *Second Blast of the Trumpet* (1558), that none of these reasons—the consent of

reveled will and approved ordinance; and finallie, it is the subversion of good Order, of all eautie and justie." Ibid., 373.

⁷⁰ John Knox to Queen Elizabeth, 20 July 1559, in *The Works of John Knox*, II, 28.

⁷¹ Ibid., 28, 29.

people, the process of time, the multitude of men, or the propinquity of blood—can establish a law to justify any rules of kings or queens, but only God's word can.⁷²

His thought is a reminder of the Protestant idea of disobedience, “we should obey God rather than men,” which had been widely displayed in the reign of Mary Tudor.

John Knox then promises the Queen, but in a tone of warning, that he will

with tounge and penn justifie your Authoritie and Regiment, as the Holy Ghost hath justified the same in Debora, that blissed mother in Israell. Bot gif the premisses (as God forbid) neglected, ye sall begin to bragg of your birth, and to builde your Authoritie and Regiment upoun your awin law, flatter you quho so list, your felicitie salbe shorte.⁷³

Queen Elizabeth is admonished by this statement that if she made any alteration of the true religion or proclaimed her sovereignty only on the basis of her birth, her subjects would have no duty to obey her any longer. Knox's point of view reveals an idea of disobedience to ungodly princes, and utilises religion as a rightful justification to depose reigning monarchs. In other words, if Elizabeth acted as her sister, Mary, who made “the simple people oppressed, the true religion extinguished, and the blood of Christes membres most cruellie shed,”⁷⁴ people should rise to depose and punish her.⁷⁵

Knox gave little defence for Elizabeth at her accession in accordance with his original thought, yet, he made himself more paradoxical by accepting Elizabeth's

⁷² Ibid., 30. The summary of the *Second Blast of the Trumpet* was printed in Knox's *Appellation*, in *The Works of John Knox*, IV, 539.

⁷³ John Knox to Queen Elizabeth, in *The Works of John Knox*, II, 31.

⁷⁴ Knox, *The First Blast*, 404.

⁷⁵ For this kind of opinion see John Knox, The summary of the *Second Blast*, 540; *A Brief Exhortation to England for the Speedy Embracing of the Gospel* (1559), in *The Works of John Knox*, V, 516-20.

government. He never treats Deborah as a king or admits her sovereignty in his *First Blast* because he declares that only men can be kings. At most, Deborah was God's instrument to reveal that God himself was able to give salvation and deliverance by means of "the moste weake vesselles," and to "ashame all men of that age."⁷⁶ Yet, in the year of 1559, Knox had expressed his readiness to accept Elizabeth's rule, who succeeded to the throne and claimed the sovereignty by temporal authority—by her right of inheritance—as shows in the royal proclamation of 17 November 1558.

Some scholars, such as Constance Jordan, view John Knox as a consistently radical opponent of woman's rule; others, like Patricia-Ann Lee, are convinced that Knox "was directed not just at women in general but at three specific female rulers: Mary of Guise, Catherine de Medici, and Mary Tudor."⁷⁷ Neither interpretation is completely true. John Knox had never given up his stand of insisting that the rule of women was generally unlawful and unnatural, but nor was he so immutably antagonistic to all female rulers. What John Knox was concerned with most was religion, and so were other Protestants. However, a feature that differentiated Knox (as well as John Ponet and Christopher Goodman) so far from most Protestants was his fervent idea of active disobedience. Among the Marian exiles, obedience to secular rulers was more prevalently stressed than rebellion, even though many of

⁷⁶ Knox, *The First Blast*, 405.

⁷⁷ Jordan, "Woman's Rule in Sixteenth-Century British Political Thought," 432; Lee, "A Bodye Politique to Governe: Aylmer, Knox and the Debate on Queenship," 242-61.

them persuaded people to bring about change within the framework of the constitution through the nobility and parliament.⁷⁸

John Knox, Thomas Bacon and Christopher Goodman were the peculiar and vociferous minority who claimed the sex of the English ruler to be a justification for open rebellion. Most Protestants, such as Henry Bullinger, John Calvin and John Foxe, still disagreed with the idea of active resistance against Catholic princes and supported the established inheritance rights to be prior to religious and sexual defects. Henry Bullinger brought out the thought before the accession of Elizabeth that although women were normally placed to be subject to men by divine hierarchy, nevertheless, if they were raised to the throne by existing laws and customs, "it is a hazardous thing for godly persons to set themselves in opposition to political regulations; especially as the gospel does not seem to unsettle or abrogate hereditary rights and the political laws of kingdoms."⁷⁹

Likewise, John Calvin suggested that although the government of woman was clearly a deviation from the proper order of nature,

there were occasionally women so endowed, that the singular good qualities which shone forth in them made it evident that they were raised up by Divine authority; . . . I came at length to this conclusion, that since, both by custom, and public consent, and long practice, it has been established, that realms and principalities may descend to females by hereditary right, it did not appear to me necessary to the question, . . . in my opinion it would

⁷⁸ Jennifer Loach, "Pamphlets and Politics, 1553-8," *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 48 (1975): 38-40.

⁷⁹ Henry Bullinger, "An Answer given to a certain Scotsman, in reply to some questions concerning the Kingdom of Scotland and England," (1554) in *The Works of John Knox*, III, 222-23.

not be lawful to unsettle governments which are ordained by the peculiar providence of God.⁸⁰

Unlike John Knox, Calvin accepted that the hereditary rights and the customs of a realm can be a lawful basis of sovereignty, which was viewed as a form of God's providence. Therefore, any uprisings against existing rulers were unlawful, and at once violated God's word.

After the accession of Elizabeth, John Knox's palpable hostility to woman's rule and the unseemly timing of its publication embarrassed many Protestants who were supporting Elizabeth's rule. The first and most famous printed pamphlet in counteraction to the indignant onslaught of Knox was John Aylmer's *An Harborowe for Faithfull and Trewe Svbiectes*. Aylmer may have consulted with other exiles before he wrote his refutation of Knox, according to John Strype.⁸¹ It was printed anonymously in Strasbourg in April 1559, before the author returned to England, but Aylmer immediately acknowledged his authorship. The work was dedicated to Francis, Earl of Bedford, and to Robert Dudley, future Earl of Leicester, both of whom were in favour with Elizabeth. Although Aylmer claimed that he published this book anonymously because he wanted to praise Elizabeth "without suspicion of flatterie, or hope of benefyt,"⁸² he actually, like many other Protestants, attempted to

⁸⁰ John Calvin, "Letter 15," in *The Zurich Letters*, second series, ed. Hastings Robinson (Cambridge: the Parker Society, 18, 1845), 15.

⁸¹ John Strype, *Historical Collections of the Life and Acts of John Aylmer, Lord Bishop of London in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* (Oxford, 1821).

⁸² John Aylmer, *An Harborowe for Faithfull and Trewe Svbiectes* (Strasbourg, 1559, STC 1005), sig. N2r.

dissociate himself from Knox's circle, and more importantly, to get rid of any malice the Queen might conceive toward him and the religion he professed.

In Aylmer's treatise, the idea of absolute obedience to secular rulers returns to the front, and gender can never be an excuse for rebellion.⁸³ He starts his text by indicating that the *First Blast*, a book written by "a Stranger" encouraged people to cast off the yoke of "obedience" to their rulers, that "hath not a lytle wounded the conscience of some symple, and almost cracked the dutie of true Obedience."⁸⁴ The theme of obedience is again brought out to end the text, where Aylmer stresses an idea of absolute and unconditional obeisance:

The frowardnes of the people is a great matter to alienate the princes mynde from them: wherefore, if thou wylt haue a good kyng or Quene: playe thou the good subiect. And if thei be of nature enclined to clemencie: prouoke them not to fure. If thei be not: rather study to wynne them by obedience, then to exaspetate them by Rebellion.

Like John Christopherson, he views any tyrannies as a kind of disgrace descended from God to punish people for their sin, and only heartfelt submission to rulers can obtain remedy and reward from God.⁸⁵

His idea of non-resistance was also very similar to early Protestants who claimed that resisting the secular rulers was to resist God since all power was

⁸³ His attitude which was shared by many other Protestants patently manifested how religious affiliation changed their view on the issue of women's rule, as Paula Scalingi suggested that "gynecocracy in theory was one thing, and in reality quite another. . . . a progynecocracy stand was a duty rather than a true indication of belief." See her "The Scepter or the Distaff: The Question of Female Sovereignty, 1516-1607," 75.

⁸⁴ Aylmer, *An Harborowe*, sig. B1r-v. For Elizabethan Protestants' doctrine of obedience, see Richard L. Greaves, "Concepts of Political Obedience in Late Tudor England: Conflicting Perspectives," *Journal of British Studies* 22 (1982): 23-34.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, sig. Q3v, Q4r.

ordained by God. Paradoxically, he reiterates a contrasting principal that "Let vs heare God rather then man," which had been emphatically used by some Marian exiles to convey the idea of disobedience. When Aylmer utilises the sentence that "we should obey God rather than men," indeed, he attempts to suggest that the result of succession which is ruled by inheritance and lineal descent is a reflection of God's will. He maintains that when there are not any male heirs, a woman by birth can lawfully succeed to the throne, for "it is a plain argument, that for some secret purpose he [God] myndeth the female should reigne and gouerne." Therefore, people must follow God's ordinance, not men's own judgement, either by the consideration of gender or religion. Aylmer thus states that "he [God] sendeth a woman by birth, we may not refuse hir by violence. He stablisheth hir by lawe, we may not remoue hir by wronge."⁸⁶

It is notable that Aylmer follows the same reasoning line of Bullinger and Calvin: the female sex is naturally weaker, less skilful and subjected to men, but God can make extraordinary exceptions. Aylmer indicates that if God "ioyne to his strengthe: she can not be weake. If he put to his hande she can not be feable, if he be with her who can stande against her?"⁸⁷ Thereby, a female heir can not only lawfully proclaim her sovereignty, but is also empowered, physically and mentally, to rule through God's magic hands. Aylmer thus sorts out the question of Elizabeth's fitness to govern by means of making her an exception. Although John Aylmer still

⁸⁶ Ibid. sig. B3r.

⁸⁷ Ibid.

admits that men are fitter and more accustomed to rule than women, he affirms that the rule of women is not repugnant to nature.

Regarding the term “nature,” Aylmer evidently differs himself from John Knox.⁸⁸ For Knox, “nature” is based only on divine law/Scripture, and Scripture solely constituted the political rule. He tolerates neither exceptions nor social customs which are not in accord with the divine order to construct rules. He pronounces that a woman's government is “unnatural” since God had created women to be in subjection, naturally unfit and essentially incapable of rule — “woman in her greatest perfection was made to serve and obey man, not to rule and command him.”⁸⁹ Aylmer does not reject the whole of Knox's idea of “nature” and defines it similarly that “Nature is nothings els but God him selfe, or a diuine order spread throughout the whole world, and ingrafte in euerye part of it, as in all fire to be hot, all water moiste.”⁹⁰ However, Aylmer argues that God occasionally does make “wonders and miracles” if “it pleseth the creator (who is the Lord of all) to alter those properties which he hath geuen them by nature.” Hence, God can raise women up to reign if he thinks it necessary. Aylmer concludes that the rule of women cannot be against nature since it had been proved by many examples, including Deborah, Queen of Sheba, Queen Cranan, Empress Theodora, and Empress Mathilda. Those exceptional paragons of female rulers in the past reveal that “by the wholle consent

⁸⁸ For a comparison between John Aylmer and John Knox, also see Jordan, “Woman's Rule in Sixteenth-Century British Political Thought,” 437-41; Lee, “A Bodye Politique to Governe: Aylmer, Knox and the Debate on Queenship.”

⁸⁹ Knox, *The First Blast*, 377.

⁹⁰ Aylmer, *An Harborowe*, sig. C3r-v.

of ancyons, by the ordinaunce of God, and order of lawe, wemen haue reigned and those not a few, and it was thoughte not againste nature.” With the fact that many women had exercised power in a variety of polities, Aylmer claims that women should not be debarred from rule just by the reason of their general disposition, and any exclusion women from such power is unnatural.⁹¹

Another battle that Aylmer wages against Knox concerning biblical interpretation is on women's right of rule and inheritance, particularly interested in two famous cases from Scripture. Aylmer brings the scope of history into his new interpretation of Scripture. The first case is St Paul's idea that women must keep silence in the Congregation, “for it is an vnsemely thinge for them to speake.” (I Corinthians 14:35) Aylmer specifies the historical situation where St Paul stated his word, for “the chefest cause that moued Paule to take thys order, was the common fault that then was in that sexe.” It is at that specific time that women generally made disturbance in the Congregation; had it been men, Aylmer is convinced that St Paul would set the same restriction. Moreover, Aylmer indicates that women were not only forbidden to speak in the Congregation, but were also kept from participation in ecclesiastical jurisdiction at that time. Yet, he does not view that fact to be evidence of woman's subjection. Instead, he points out this situation to be the result of a historical context—women's deficiency of education at that time, “for they bee not broughte vppe in learynge in Schooles, nor trayned in disputacions.” Therefore, it was not the natural weakness of women, but the social customs of a

⁹¹ Ibid., sig. C3v.

particular period that expropriated women's public function.⁹² He argues further that even though women had no great learning, they still could take charge of public affairs, because St. Paul's restriction on women was only in the service of "the greater and more chargeable function"—the spiritual ministry and preaching. But St. Paul did not exclude women from the duty of political affairs which requires less learning but a greater sense of justice than in dealing with religious affairs.⁹³

The other case from Scripture is that God commanded men to choose kings "from amongst their brethern, and not among they systers" (Deuteronomy 17:15). Aylmer reinterprets it in the historical context of language. He indicates that "through out the whole scripture the masculine comprehendeth the feminine," so this speech which commanded a brother to be the king of the Jews does not mean to exclude a sister; instead, it specifically refers to "straungers." According to the textual context and historical situation, Aylmer further argues that God precluded a foreigner from reigning over Jews because all the neighbouring nations of the Jews were not worshipping the true God. To choose a king from their own brothers or sisters, instead of a foreigner, the Jews would not be in danger of falling into idolatry.⁹⁴ In sum, Aylmer analyses Scripture in the context of the historical and social situation and hence concludes that it does not mean to degrade the female sex, nor does it in any way deny the legitimacy of woman's rule. For Aylmer, any cases

⁹² Ibid., sig. G4r-v.

⁹³ Ibid., sig. I4r.

⁹⁴ Ibid., sig. K3r.

from the bible cannot be viewed isolatedly, but should be explained and utilised variously according to the specific situation and pattern.

The same consideration is applied to Roman Law (or civil law) which is exploited by Knox to negate women's right in government. Knox points out that, in the Law, "women are removed frome all civile and publike office, so they nether may be Judges, nether may they occupie the place of the Magistrate; nether yet may they be speakers for others."⁹⁵ However, Aylmer pronounces that although Roman Law is "the best, the perfightest and the largest, that euer was made," it is not appropriate to every country, and an individual nation should follow its own law and custom, for which suits each country best, "like as euery fielde bringeth not forth al frutes: so is not one law mete for al countries."⁹⁶ He admits that Roman Law can apply to such cases as testaments and marriages, however, for the issues of "landes, and enheritance, pains for offences and many other poynts touching the law: ours doth meruelously iarre with the ciuill law."⁹⁷ He argues that the case of Elizabeth's rule should be related to English common law by which a female heir may succeed to the Crown when there is no male alternative.

Apart from those differences between Aylmer and Knox, they contradict each other again in the status of womanhood. For Knox, women's inferiority and subjection to men which had been stressed by early Church Fathers are generally applied to all women, married or unmarried, and "all woman is commanded to serve,

⁹⁵ Knox, *The First Blast*, 375.

⁹⁶ Aylmer, *An Harborowe*, sig. K4r.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, sig. K4v.

to be in humilitie and subjection.”⁹⁸ Furthermore, Knox affirms that the same submission of women is reflected both in body natural and body politic. He argues that the head shall occupy the uppermost place and rule other members of the human body, and that the man is naturally ordained to bear the office of the head and the woman to the other parts of the body. By this reasoning, if a woman bears the sovereignty as the head of the civil body of the commonwealth, Knox represents that as monstrous: as if the legs rule the head in the human body.⁹⁹ In contrast with Knox, Aylmer argues that the Church Fathers' commandment only applied to private women within the bonds of marriage, so an unmarried woman or a king's daughter whom “God by birth hath called to the governments of realmes,” is not bound in subjection to men; even a married woman is not asked to obey every man except for her husband.¹⁰⁰

As for a married ruling queen, Aylmer suggests that she is allowed to have double roles, a private one and a public one. In private life, she has to observe wifely submission to her husband, but in public charge, she can be the head of her husband,

so farre as pertaineth to the bandes of mariage, and the office of a wife, she muste be a subiecte: but as a Magistrate she may be her husbands head. For the Scripture saithe not. . . . if the childe by nature a subiect, maye be by lawe a heade, yea the heade of his father, and his father his subiecte: Whie may not the woman be the husbandes inferiour in matters of wedlock, and his head in the guiding of the common welth.¹⁰¹

⁹⁸ Knox, *The First Blast*, 385.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 390-91.

¹⁰⁰ Aylmer, *An Harborowe*, sig. H4v.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, sig., C4v.

Therefore, Aylmer affirms that the teaching of women's subjection is not a universal principle for all women in all periods of their lives. He optimistically believes that a woman's private and public roles can be separated and these double roles can be combined in one person without contradiction, like the body natural and body politic. Therefore a queen can be her husband's subject, and at the same time, be his master.

By all these means, Aylmer attends to justify the legitimacy of gynecocracy, particularly for Queen Elizabeth who, "having the consent of hir people, the stablishment of lawe, auncient custome, and Gods calling," lawfully succeeded the Crown.¹⁰² Nevertheless, most feminist scholars may not find Aylmer's work less insulting to women than John Knox's because Aylmer's text continued the negative perception of the female sex. Aylmer does not deny that women are created soft and feeble, neither that the normal pattern is men to bear the political rule, as Constance Jordan comments that "Aylmer's defense of woman's rule did not challenge the fundamentally restrictive concept of womankind current in the mid sixteenth-century."¹⁰³ Locating him in the tradition of humanists' conception of women, Aylmer's position is very close to that of Erasmus and Vives, whose instruction of women did not intend to teach women to rule a school, to govern a country, or to speak in public, but only to learn letters "for herself alone and her young children, or her sister in our Lord."¹⁰⁴ Erasmus, Vives and Aylmer all refuse

¹⁰² Ibid., sig., M1r-v.

¹⁰³ Jordan, "Woman's Rule in Sixteenth-Century British Political Thought," 441.

¹⁰⁴ Juan Luis Vives, *The Instruction of a Christian Woman*, in *Vives and the Renaissance Education of Women*, ed. Foster Watson (London: Edward Arnold, 1912), 55.

to accept any woman to be suitable to exercise formal political services, only except when there was not legal male heir to the throne.

Aylmer's view of the female sex, in comparison with those more pro-feminist humanist works, such as Henricus Cornelius Agrippa's *De nobilitate et praecellentia sexus foeminei* (1509) and Thomas Elyot's *Defence of Good Women* (1540), is rather conservative. He, similar to Agrippa, suggests in his text that women's incapability of public functions resulted from their lack of education, a result of cultural forces. However, unlike Agrippa who further promotes women as God's most perfect and honourable product, Aylmer withdraws his slight sympathy with women's social situation in general and turns to the focus of those exceptional women who can rule in their own right by the hereditary right. Nevertheless, if we take consideration of his effort not to turn upside down the existing social order and Protestant stress on wifely submission, his conservatism is understandable and quite consistent with his emphasis on obedience.

Aylmer's tactics to refute John Knox's insult on to women's rule were skilful. Moreover, the strategy that distinguishes Elizabeth from other women as an extraordinary exception created by God's favour matched Elizabeth's own perception of her rule, that it was specially preserved and ordained by God. However, there is no evidence that Queen Elizabeth read this treatise, or what her view was towards this apology for her right to rule. It seemed that Aylmer did not get much of Elizabeth's favour and attention since he was not promoted by the Queen soon after he returned to England; nor could he realise his dream of becoming bishop of London

until 1576, although his slow advancement might to some degree relate to the Puritans' hostility towards him.¹⁰⁵ Nonetheless, his reinterpretation of Scripture, in contrast with Protestant polemical writers against gynecocracy, and as well as his pragmatic resolution which based on existing law and custom to legalise the queen's rule, had tremendous influence on the later defences of the queen's rule. To a great degree, his method and argument became the mainstream of this genre of writings in the latter half of the sixteenth century. More significantly, his resolution surprisingly proved to be a polemical line which would adopt by both Protestants and Catholics.

IV. The defence of the queen's rule after 1570

John Aylmer's point of view was first echoed and furthered by Catholic apologists for Mary, Queen of Scots. The two most famous defences for Mary Stuart were John Leslie's *A Defence of the Honour of Marie Quene of Scotlande* (1569) and David Chambers' *Discours de la Légitime Succession des Femmes* (1579). John Leslie, Mary's representative in Elizabeth's court, is very similar to Aylmer in his historical and linguistic scope and in his interpretation of nature and Scripture, arguing that "neither this worde brother excludethe a sister, nor this worde kinge in Scripture excludethe a quene."¹⁰⁶ Again, he lays the same emphasis as

¹⁰⁵ Strype, *Historical Collections*, 16.

¹⁰⁶ John Leslie, *A Defence of the Honour of Marie Quene of Scotlande* (London, 1569), reprinted in facsimile in *English Recusant Literature, 1558-1640*, vol. 12 (New York: Scholar Press, 1970), sig. R7r.

Aylmer upon the law of nations which is based on past experience and customs. The work of David Chambers, a Scottish courtier of Catherine de Médici in the French court, goes further than John Aylmer's and John Leslie's. He not only contends that both law of nature and law of nations had protected the property rights of women, which is crucial to their right of succession to the throne, but also argues that women are inherently (not some exceptional women mysteriously appointed by God) suitable to rule in all sorts of polities, including an elected monarchy. His view is therefore "the most liberal position on the question of woman's rule adopted during the course of the century."¹⁰⁷

Among the defenders of Queen Elizabeth, William Fleetwood, the Recorder of London, followed the line of John Aylmer by his small but significant treatise, *Itinerarium ad Windsor*, written in 1575. His motivation to write this treatise is not clear, perhaps he wished he might win the Queen's favour. Fleetwood's work is a brief dialogue among three persons, Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, Thomas Sackville, Lord Buckhurst, and William Fleetwood himself, who conversed on the road from London to Windsor.¹⁰⁸ Fleetwood presents a peculiar political history with legal principles for female rulers in this work, naturally for his background of a legal scholar and an antiquarian. Its scale is much smaller than John Aylmer's pamphlet, and rather limited to practical investigation of succession laws, remarking

¹⁰⁷ Jordan, *Renaissance Feminism*, 246.

¹⁰⁸ William Fleetwood had close relationship with Robert Dudley. Under Dudley's influence, William was elected to be the Recorder of London on 26 April 1571, and in the same year, he accepted a commission to inquire into the English customs. See *Dictionary of National Biography* (London, 1908-9), vol. 7, 68-69.

very slightly on biblical and moral aspects. Although this author has been the subject of study, what has not been done is to place his work in the larger context of the sixteenth-century debate on women's rule.¹⁰⁹ Actually, this treatise provides a very interesting insight into the English common laws concerning queen regnant's regal power upon which Queen Elizabeth might affirmatively build her right to rule. Furthermore, shaping his arguments in precedents and law of nations, William Fleetwood rather tangibly manifests John Aylmer's pragmatic solution for women's rule.

This dialogue is conducted in a question-and-answer format, led by the Earl of Leicester, to discuss the question: "why the queene our mistress should haue and execute the like and the same prerogatives and other regal preheminences as haue bene giuen onely by parliament vnto her highenes most noble progenitors being kings, and by the special names of kings, and not vnto them by the names of kings or queens."¹¹⁰ Lord Buckhurst first responds to the question by mentioning the application of the law of the Crown to female heirs. He states that "by the law of the crowne of England it hath bene accustomed that the Crowne ought to succeed and

¹⁰⁹ Four articles touching on the author and his work are John Bruce, "Particulars respecting Thomas Sackville, Lord Buckhurst, with a fragment of the '*Itinerarium ad Windsor*.' written by Mr. Serjeant Fleetwood, Recorder of London," *Archaeologia* 37-1 (1856): 351-62; Dennis Moore, "Recorder Fleetwood and the Tudor Queenship Controversy," in *Ambiguous Realities: Women in the Middle Ages and Renaissance*, eds., Carole Levin and Jeanie Watson (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1987), 235-51; J. D. Alsop, "The Act for the Queen's Regal Power, 1554," *Parliamentary History* 13-1 (1994): 261-76; and his "William Fleetwood and Elizabethan Historical Scholarship," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 25-1 (1994): 155-76.

¹¹⁰ William Fleetwood, *Itinerarium ad Windsor*, British Library, Harley MSS 6234, f. 12v.

goe to the eldest daughter when the female are heritable," which had been effectuated in the statute of Henry VIII's second Succession Act (28 Henry VIII, cap. 7).¹¹¹

Then, the Recorder proceeds to expound the succession right of women in a broader scope. First, he brings in a historical and linguistic understanding of the names of kings and queens:

I doe reade that this word king is a Saxon term, and doth originaly come and growe of the old Saxon word *Cyning*. which doth signifie a cuninge, a wise, a vertuous, a pollitique, and a prudent person, fitt to gouerne as well in greate as in warrs. And this worde Queene in the same toungue is in effect of the same force, referring the same to the female sex.

The names of both kings and queens were invested with the same privilege and virtue in Saxon tongue, the Recorder therefore confirms that the crown of England is not always sent to male successors, "if there want heires males, then ought it to discend to the heires females."¹¹² Second, the Recorder touches on the daughters of Zelophehad in Scripture (Numbers 27:1-8), who were commanded by the mouth of Moses to succeed their father's land on the ground that they did not have any other brothers alive. This is important evidence of women's right of inheritance from Scripture exploited by many defences of women's rule in the sixteenth century. Lord Buckhurst subsequently joins the Recorder in this case, stating that God commanded "if a man die without a sonne, his inheritance shall passe vnto his daughter."¹¹³ Third, most importantly, the Recorder emphasises that historical precedents in English history had shown that women do have a lawful right to

¹¹¹ Ibid., f. 14v.

¹¹² Ibid., f. 15v.

¹¹³ Ibid., f. 19v.

succeed the Crown by their lineal blood, presented by such queens as Cordelia and Matilda the Empress. He reinforces his argument with more cases of male kings who claimed the throne by their mother's side, like King Stephen, "soe Kinge Stephen was not able to make arguments why the female ought not to inherite the crowne, because he him selfe claymed the crowne by Adela his mother, who was . . . the eldest daughter of the Conquerour."¹¹⁴

In accordance with John Aylmer's view, William Fleetwood distinctly exemplifies that past experience and the English practice of inheritance do essentially and substantially endorse the notion of women's government. He urges people to follow old customs and constitutions as he himself manages his manner of arguments which "hath allwaies bene grounded vpon authorities and presidents and not on reasons invented by my selfe: And therefore it is to be remembred that myne argument is not my owne argument, but the speaches and iudgements of those that first sett them down."¹¹⁵

As a legal practitioner, William Fleetwood not only brings in the equality of kings and queens based on old customs and common laws, but also introduces the innovative idea of the queen's two bodies into the defence of the queen's rule. In the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, several common lawyers had developed a theory connecting the monarch and realm, in order to view them together as a perpetual corporation. Although the idea of the monarch's two bodies stemmed from a

¹¹⁴ Ibid., f. 16v.

¹¹⁵ Ibid., f. 17r.

medieval concept as Ernst Kantorowicz's famous study has shown, it was the first time the same theory applied to a ruling queen.¹¹⁶ This theory endows a queen with two bodies: a body natural and a body politic; the one is a queen's personal and natural body and the other is *corporate perpetuity*. Fleetwood was certainly familiar with this theory and elucidates its essence that the body natural is subject to infancy, weakness, age, sickness and all other defects found in all natural bodies, but the body politic is "impassible consisting of pollicie and gouernment constituted for the direction of the people, and . . . the publique welath," which never suffers infancy, infirmity and age.¹¹⁷ Neither any natural defect of a monarch—a minor age or a female sex—can impeach or blemish his/her body politic.

Fleetwood further pronounces that the natural body of a queen as well as a king becomes a corporate body when it is invested with the royal estate and dignity:

the bodies naturall and the bodie pollitique conjoyned in vntie are become inseperable; And those two bodies being thus in one person Incorporated, doe make one sole bodie, and not diuers bodies. . . . And thus may you see, that the naturall bodie, by vntie with the bodie pollitique (which bodie pollitique containeth the office and gouernment and maiestie Royall) is magnified and becomes . . . the soule and spirit of the bodie corporate.

He stresses that this corporate body will never die even if the monarch's natural body passed away.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁶ Ernst H. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957). For this idea's application to the succession controversy in the reign of Elizabeth see Marie Axton, *The Queen's Two Bodies: Drama and the Elizabethan Succession* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1977).

¹¹⁷ Fleetwood, *Itinerarium ad Windsor*, f. 24v.

¹¹⁸ Ibid., ff. 24v-25r.

The political implication in the idea of the monarch's two bodies is not only helpful to drawing away the attack on the natural deficiency of King Edward VI's minority as it has shown in previous chapter, but also the weakness of Mary Tudor's and Elizabeth's gender. It implies that a female heir (or a child king) not only can lawfully succeed to the throne, but is also capable of exercising power and executing justice because those are operated by her corporate body which is unerring and immortal. The concept is different from John Aylmer's differentiation of a queen's private office as a wife in the household and her public office as a monarch in the state. In Aylmer's perception of women's double roles, the married queen still has to observe the wifely duty of submission to her husband in her private life, since it is a sphere separated from the public sphere. However, in the theory of the queen's two bodies, her body natural is conjoined with her body politic and thus transferred into just "one especiall, singular, and inseparable vnitie."¹¹⁹ As long as this new corporate body is united and indivisible, it holds consistent and perpetual attributes defined by royal dignity, which leads the queen to be exempted from any intervention of her natural body and private obligation. Therefore, the ruling queen is never bound by traditional relationships between wives and husbands; she is always the head of all her subjects. Accordingly, the idea of the queen's two bodies employed by Fleetwood endows the ruling queen with a stronger status and more complete power than Aylmer's work.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., f. 25r.

None the less, Fleetwood's work did not have a better destiny than Aylmer's. His unpublished tract seems only had a limited circulation, and he himself was not able to receive preferment from the Queen through his efforts in defending the queen's rule. The defence of the women's rule was then succeeded by Henry Howard's *A Dutiful Defense of the Lawful Regiment of Women*, written probably from 1580 and finished in 1589 or 1590, and it was not printed, either. Howard was a Catholic and the purpose of his work was obviously to rehabilitate himself in Queen Elizabeth's favour after the long downfall of his family caused by the intrigue of his brother, Thomas Howard, Duke of Norfolk, to marry Mary, Queen of Scots.¹²⁰ Howard's treatise was the most capacious defence of women's rule in the sixteenth century with the broadest range of material, crammed with abundant legal, biblical, philosophical, and historical references from ancient authorities to contemporary cases. Nevertheless, it has not been seriously noted by modern scholarship until the 1990s,¹²¹ much less has it been put in the context of sixteenth-century defences of the

¹²⁰ For the life of Henry Howard, see *Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. 10, 28-32; and Linda Levy Peck, *Northampton: Patronage and Policy at the Court of James I* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1982). This manuscript begins with a title page announcing the subject of his work: "A dutiful defense of the Lawful Regiment of weomen, divided into three bookes. The first conteyneth reasons and examples grownded on the law of nature. The second, reasons and examples grownded on the ciuile laws; the third, reasons and examples grownded on the sacred laws of god with an answer to all false and friuolous obiections which have been most vnjustly countenanced with deceitful coulors forced owte of these lawes in disgrace of theire approued and sufficient aucthorytie." f. 3r.

¹²¹ The first significant study of Howard's tract on women's rule and its background is Amanda Shephard's "Henry Howard and the Lawful Regiment of Women," *History of Political Thought* 12-4 (1991): 589-603; more in her *Gender and Authority*. In addition, two other works are contributed to this search: Dennis Moore, "Dutifully Defending Elizabeth: Lord Henry Howard and the Question of Queenship," in *Political Rhetoric, Power, and Renaissance Woman*, eds. Carole Levin and Patricia A. Sullivan (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995); Benson, "Defense of Female Regiment: Practical Politics," in her *The Invention of the Renaissance Woman*, 231-50.

queen's rule and the frame of John Aylmer's inventive work as this chapter seeks to do.

Howard's work starts with a long dedication letter to Queen Elizabeth. In this letter to the Queen, Howard expounds his long torment, concluding that the success of his work relies on divine providence and Elizabeth's acceptance. The letter also contains an exuberant compliment to the Queen's great achievements in her reign, which excessively manifests Howard's attempt to win Elizabeth's favour. Then Howard's treatise is divided into three books, each explaining a different aspect of women's status in general and queens' in particular. Book One, which contains five chapters, discusses the position of women according to the law of nature, particularly focusing on the spiritual equality of men and women in the first creation. This book is the largest and provides the groundwork for later arguments in other books. Book Two deals with the position of women under Roman Law, to which John Aylmer had only lightly touched. It argues that civil law does not condemn the rule of women, and on the contrary, it actually supports women's right of inheritance shown by many historical instances of women who actually ruled or held political positions in the Roman Empire. Book Three attends to the position of women on the basis of the law of God, especially the political history of the Jews where many women were chosen by God to bear rule and never excluded from sovereignty. Each book brings in several "objectios" in the end from the writings of the opponents of women's rule and then follows with detailed refutations. The "objectios" do not seem to be exact quotations from particular works. Largely, Howard counterattacks John Knox's

First Blast and George Buchanan's *De iure regni apud Scotos* (1579) and *Rerum Scoticarum historia* (1582);¹²² but in fact, he intends to refute all the opponents together.

Pamela Benson in her study of Howard's treatise comments that it is much more humanist than Catholic, for it redefines "the notion of woman and her social role" by its considerable emphasis on the equality of the two sexes. However, Dennis Moore views it more in the tradition of conservatism, a reconciliation of queenship and patriarchy. He describes the dynamic of the whole treatise as "a downward spiral," beginning with women's spiritual equality to men in Book One, but ending with the narrow principle of women's right of inheritance in Book Three.¹²³ However, if we examine throughout the whole *Dutiful Defense*, Dennis Moore's suggestion is apparently closer to the truth, but he ignores that each of these three Books has its internal coherence. It is not a "downward spiral" from Book One to Book Three, but each book contains the pattern of a downward spiral. Each of the three books in Howard's treatise begins with the general promotion of women's social role and status but finally narrows down to the queen's special position by her right of

¹²² Nevertheless, the issue of women's rule per se was not the main theme of George Buchanan's dialogue, *De iure Regni apud Scotos* and his history of Scotland, although the misrule of Mary, Queen of Scots, situated as the background of his works. For Buchanan and his political thought see, P. H. Brown, *George Buchanan* (Edinburgh: David Douglas, 1980); I. D. McFarlane, *Buchanan* (London: Duckworth, 1981); H. R. Trevor-Roper, *George Buchanan and the Ancient Scottish Constitution* (English Historical Review, Supplement 3, 1966); J. H. Burns, "Politics, Humanism, History: George Buchanan and his Critics," in his *The True Law of Kingship: Concepts of Monarchy in Early-Modern Scotland* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996).

¹²³ Benson, *The Invention of the Renaissance Woman*, 240; Moore, "Dutifully Defending Elizabeth," 128-30.

inheritance which lays queens apart from the common restrictions of women in society.

It becomes a normal pattern in *Dutiful Defense* that Howard always draws a line to separate the female heirs who can inherit the political charge from the private women. In Book One, Howard starts with the Book of Genesis to argue that the woman was created as perfectly as the man. He indicates that Eve had been created as an equal to Adam, not created to be his servant or subject, but his aid and help. They had "one creation, one capacity of grace, one vertue, one honour," which made neither sex claim to be above the other. Furthermore, both man and woman are created capable of government as "the same domynion which God gave to Adam and Eve at the first creation of the world over beasts, fistes, fowles etc."¹²⁴ Hence, Howard declares that,

women are as capable of all those guifts which enable men to Rule as men themselves. And therefore ought not to bee limited or hindred in the clayme of their inheritance. Furthermore it shall appeare that the Regiment of women by succession of bloud hath beene admitted by all countryes allowed by all persons and defended vpon all occasions. Therefore it cannot bee accounted as a Monster made without an ordianry mould, nor disdayned as a wonder that is never seene but in a wildernesse.¹²⁵

Contrary to John Knox, Howard pronounces that the women's rule is essentially natural, not a monster or a wonder; it was in accordance with the law of nature, and had been proven by a number of precedents in history.

¹²⁴ Howard, *A Dutiful Defense*, ff. 30r, 32v, 38r.

¹²⁵ Ibid., f. 32r.

Then, Howard moves his discussion to women's right of succession to the crowns and kingdoms, declaring that which has been acknowledged "since the first beginning of the world by all countryes vnder heaven . . . and that noe exception was even taken to their rule by men of vnderstanding and humanity before our age in respect of any imperfection."¹²⁶ At the same time, he also places himself more in the real society where men are viewed as more suitable to rule, and significantly his position becomes closer to John Aylmer's. He accepts the situation of women's inferior role in the existing social structure, and advocates that it is the lack of education and experience which make women less capable of participating in politics than men as he states that "it noe marvill that men have commonly the vpper hand considering the manner of their education in schooles and vniversities . . . while women are shutt vpp in private howses and onely taught to plye their worke."¹²⁷ Moreover, like Aylmer, Howard persistently points out that women's subjection is only presumed to apply to married women in their matrimonial relationship with their husbands.

Following the pragmatic line of Aylmer, Howard strongly declares women's right of inheritance based on Roman Law, while Aylmer relies more on the law of nations. He argues that Justinian's *Institutes* allowed female heirs to succeed to kingdoms by close blood ties, regardless of their sex. The female heirs, in Howard's point of view, contrary to common women, privileged by their blood, are

¹²⁶ Ibid., f. 38v.

¹²⁷ Ibid., f. 96r.

not constrained by these restrictions on common women. Their right in government cannot be hindered by any excuse of women's deficiency, much less by any claim regarding their education, since these female heirs "whose education hath been suitable to their estate know better then the vulgar sorte," were capable of governing their countries beneficially and reasonably.¹²⁸

The same narrowing down and distinction between private women and female heirs are displayed in two other books of *Dutiful Defense*, and accordingly, Howard lays more stress on the righteousness of inheritance by blood. In Book Two, Howard argues that both men and women are equally admitted to succeed the possession of their progenitors according to Roman Law, and he states that "the body of the Civell Text prescribeth bounde and limitte to the dealinge and actions of private women, but not of heirs to crownes." That is to say, a princess is always free from civil obligations in respect of her prerogative.¹²⁹ He consistently emphasises the necessity of a distinction between private persons and heirs to crowns, even the true meaning of civil law cannot be rightly understood without "a manifest distinction between the course of ordinary actions and the government of pollitick estates, betweene private persons that are occupyed with howshould cares and heirs to crownes that rule by pollicie."¹³⁰

In Book Three, Howard provides readers with two cases from Scripture to justify women's right of inheritance. One is the daughters of Zelophehad who

¹²⁸ Ibid., f. 97v.

¹²⁹ Ibid., ff. 145r, 158r.

¹³⁰ Ibid., f. 167r.

succeed their father's portion of land in default of male heirs by God's commandment. By the same case, John Knox argues in his *First Blast* that it is lawful for women to possess property from their progenitors, but it is never lawful for them to succeed the office and rule over men.¹³¹ But Howard contends that women are lawfully admitted by God to succeed to all titles as well as estate that linked to inheritance. The other case is that of the transmission to Christ by his mother, Virgin Mary, of the kingdom of the Jews. According to the Bible, Mary was the sole true and lawful heir to the Crown of Juda, "soe y^e right which Christ in beeing heire to Juda might most iustly clayme to the Jewish crowne."¹³² With this case that Christ's inheritance of the kingdom was justified by her mother's side, Howard argues that women's right of inheritance by their blood had been acknowledged by the law of God.

Howard reinforces his argument further in his interpretation of St. Paul's teaching of women's subjection in Corinthians and Timothy. He does not directly repudiate St. Paul's doctrine, but declares that although St. Paul commanded wives to be submissive, he did allow women to rule. Like John Aylmer, Howard differentiates the woman's duty of a wife and that of a magistrate, and affirms that a woman can be her husband's head in public charge though she cannot be his head in the bond of matrimony. A comparison of the relationship between the father and son is thus made to that of the husband and wife: a son can be free from his father's

¹³¹ Knox, *The First Blast*, 409.

¹³² Howard, *A Dutiful Defense*, f. 191v.

power because of public duty, as can a woman from her husband. Therefore, Howard settles that the husband's power over the wife cannot debar a female heir from succession to the throne, since "publicke charges are not subiect to domesticall considerations."¹³³

It is notable that Howard, like John Aylmer, never denies that men have priority in the succession and in an ideal situation the magistracy would always be exercised by men. Moreover, men are generally perceived stronger, more excellent and more worthy of honour, women therefore have never been elected to the positions of power under the election system. But should this reality diminish women's right and sufficiency in exercising power? Howard rejects this thought and sustains that the institution of inheritance linked to succession in blood by lineal and natural descent is far better than election and it is also better for people to accept a ruler chosen by the wisdom of God than by themselves.¹³⁴

Howard emphasises his point of view about the righteousness of hereditary succession in Book One. He argues that in the beginning the king was chosen by people for his worth, but after the first king deceased there then followed long uncertainty and factional competition because every man wanted to make himself a king. In order to end all the factionalism, Howard declares that to limit a kingdom by blood succession and leave the decision to God's will became the best way to dissolve all uncertainty and instability:

¹³³ Ibid., ff. 208v, 215r.

¹³⁴ Ibid., ff. 243v-44r.

how much more safe it is to fall into the hande of god then men and to trust his providence then their onwe discretion. It is certayne that they could noe longer serve them selves at pleasure, but were bound to serve and honour whom soever God would send by ordenarie meane whether he were a David for our comforte or a Saul for our correction.¹³⁵

For Howard, the inheritance by lineal descent is a constitution absolutely correct and resistible neither by force nor by sexual difference. The subjects must place their destiny into God's hands, for "what soever God determineth must bee putt in execution without excuse. If he had not thought a woman fitt to rule he would never have appointed her."¹³⁶ His insistence on "the right of bloud" is reinforced by his calling of obedience to queen's rule. Similarly to Aylmer, Howard is convinced that the order of succession perfectly reflects the choice of God, "either in his favour or in his indignation." Therefore, to resist the queen's government is to resist God's will.¹³⁷

Although Howard spends numerous pages in discussing women's spiritual worth and equality to men, his principal arguments evidently agree with John Aylmer's conservatism in two places: inherited succession and political obedience to the queen's rule. Fundamentally, John Aylmer, Henry Howard, William Fleetwood, and many other Protestants, in confronting the generally presumed instability of female monarchy, all chose to settle a pragmatic resolution based on English common laws and women's right of inheritance.¹³⁸ This resolution is intended to

¹³⁵ Ibid., ff. 124v, 125r.

¹³⁶ Ibid. f. 89v.

¹³⁷ Ibid., ff. 125r, 246v.

¹³⁸ This trend was also reflected in two Elizabethan works. One was Thomas Smith's *De Republica Anglorum: The maner of Gouvernement or Policie of the Realme of England* (London, 1583; reprinted in facsimile by Amsterdam: Da Capo Press, 1970). Smith articulates that the male

promote an image of stability under the queen's rule. Consequently, Aylmer stresses that a queen's rule would not be more dangerous than a king's in England since this realm is ruled by law and parliament, and Howard emphasises that it is far safer to obey the queen's rule than to overthrow her succession by violence.¹³⁹ In spite of different religions, their treatises none the less shared the same consideration of history and interpretation of Scripture in respect of the woman's rule. The similarity between John Aylmer's work and Henry Howard's indeed outweighs their difference which has been mistakenly exaggerated by Pamela Benson. Benson suggests that Aylmer's tract defends Elizabeth but does not defend womankind, and Howard's defence is on the contrary.¹⁴⁰ In fact, neither Aylmer nor Howard had seriously revised the notion of women and their social role in general, but only meant to defend princesses, Elizabeth Tudor, in particular. Furthermore, there was not such a clear gap as Benson advocates between the Protestants and Catholics with regard to their defence of queen's rule.¹⁴¹

sex was created with more strength and courage to command women and generally women were rejected from rule. However, he makes a distinction between a queen by her right of blood and common women, "for the right and honour of the blood, and the quietnes and suertie of the realme, is more to be considered, than either the tender age as yet impotent to rule, or the sexe not accustomed (otherwise) to intermeddle with publicks affaires." sig. D2r. The other was *A Mirror for Magistrates* which was written in about 1555 but was not fully published until 1578; it went through seven editions in the reign of Elizabeth and became one of the most popular works in the Renaissance. Concerning the problem of the women's rule, this work more stresses on women's right of government and declared that "for whatsoever man, woman, or childe, is by the consente of the whole reamlme established in the royall seat, so it have not bene iniuriously procured by rigour of sword and open force, but quietlie by title, eyther of enherytaunce, succession, lawful bequest, common consent, or eleccion, is vndoubtedlye chosen by God to be his deputie; and whosoever resisteth anye such, resisteth agaynst God himselfe, and is a ranke traytour and rebell, . . ." Cited in Lily B. Campbell, *Tudor Conceptions of History and Tragedy in "A Mirroe For Magistrates"* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1936), 14-15.

¹³⁹ Aylmer, *An Harborowe*, sig. H3r.

¹⁴⁰ Benson, *The Invention of the Renaissance Woman*, 240.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 232. Benson advocates that the defences of women's rule in the reign of Elizabeth can be divided into "two distinct groups defined by the ambition of their authors and by their resolution of the

These defences of woman's rule for Queen Elizabeth even shared the same destiny in lacking the Queen's support. It is not certain whether Howard's treatise was actually presented to the Queen and what her reaction to it was if she ever read it. But his luck was no better than that of John Aylmer and William Fleetwood, neither of whom gained Elizabeth's favour by their defence of the queen's rule. Howard did not actually win higher preferment until the accession of James I and he became the Earl of Northampton in 1604.

It is noteworthy that none of the particular defences of the queen's rule for Elizabeth was printed in England as were many of Elizabethan government propaganda. This is an odd but intriguing situation since so many Catholics continually challenged Elizabeth's legitimacy and her supporters increasingly perceived the necessity to defend Elizabeth's status, particularly in the beginning years of her reign and in the crisis of the Pope's Bull in 1570.¹⁴²

The failure to print any work in defence of Elizabeth's rule in respect of gynocracy would be better understood in relation to the controversy of succession in Elizabeth's reign and the Queen's attitude towards it. The question of succession had been brought to the front as early as Elizabeth succeeded to the throne, particularly focused on two female claimants: Lady Catherine Grey and Mary Queen of Scots. However, Queen Elizabeth apparently disliked the discussion of any issue

dilemma posed by the independent woman." One is Protestants' "extraordinary-woman theory," the other is Catholics' belief in women's autonomy.

¹⁴² For Catholic attack on Elizabeth as an illegitimate usurper see James Emerson Phillips, *Images of a Queen: Mary Stuart in Sixteenth-Century Literature* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1964), under the index of Elizabeth I.

concerning the succession and hesitated to limit the succession to the Crown. She had emphatically expressed several times her reluctance to nominate her successor, out of the consideration of her own and the country's safety and the avoidance of faction. For instance, both in 1563 and 1566 the parliament sought to move the Queen to name her successor, but both efforts failed. The Queen even angrily termed parliament's request as "a straunge thyng that the foote sholde dyrecte the hede in so weyghtye a cause." Elizabeth also justified her attitude by recalling the danger she suffered as the successor of Mary Tudor in Mary's reign. She stated that "there was not one of theym that evere was a seconde parson as I have byn, and have tastede of the practyses ageynst my systere" ¹⁴³

Those defences of the queen's rule, however, carried a number of elements manifestly relating to the issue of succession which agitated Queen Elizabeth. First, all the three writers mentioned above were suspected to be involved in the controversy of succession. William Fleetwood with many other Protestants was suspected to be involved in a conspiracy to promote Lady Catherine's claim in 1564, aroused by John Hale's *A Declaration of the Succession of the Crown Imperial of England*. ¹⁴⁴ John Aylmer also had persistent contact with the Grey family from the days of his tutoring Lady Jane Grey, one of learned ladies in Tudor age. ¹⁴⁵ As for

¹⁴³ *Parliaments*, I, 147. Elizabeth also accounted the reasons for her reluctance to name a successor to Maitland of Lethington who visited Elizabeth with a mission for Mary Stuart's succession in 1561, see Hayward, *Annals*, 80-85.

¹⁴⁴ Levine, *The Early Elizabethan Succession Question*, 69-80.

¹⁴⁵ For Aylmer's instruction of Lady Jane Grey's learning, see Carole Levin, "Lady Jane Grey: Protestant Queen and Martyr," in *Silent But for the Words: Tudor Women as Patrons, Translators, and Writers of Religious Works*, ed. Margaret Patterson Hannay (Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1985), 92-105.

Henry Howard, since 1570 he had suffered from the Queen's and her ministers' long-standing suspicions regarding his attachment with Mary Stuart's claim. Therefore, these three writers were not entirely free from the controversy of succession.

Secondly, although those defences particularly stood for Elizabeth, actually, their arguments could not only promote one queen—Elizabeth, specifically, but also benefit all female pretenders to the English throne in general. Elizabeth would perhaps perceive that these works to be intended to support either Lady Catherine or Mary Stuart, for some of their theories had been and could be similarly applied to female claimants of the English Crown. For instance, blood succession was strongly claimed by both sides of the supporters, forming a competition between the Suffolk and Stuart lines: Lady Catherine was the granddaughter of Henry VII's younger daughter, Mary Tudor, Queen of France and Duchess of Suffolk, and Mary Stuart was the granddaughter of Henry VII's eldest daughter, Margaret Tudor, Queen of Scotland. Another case was the theory of the queen's two bodies which had been utilised by Edmund Plowden in his treatise *Leycester's Commonwealth* in 1584 to promote Mary Stuart. Plowden's succession treatise of 1584 greatly irritated Queen Elizabeth and she took a vigorous measures to suppress its circulation. This theory of the queen's two bodies thus came to be a dangerous topic.¹⁴⁶ Basically, Elizabeth viewed any request and tracts of succession as a challenge to her safety and sovereignty. The defence of the queen's rule was therefore easily tainted with

¹⁴⁶ Axton, *The Queen's Two Bodies*, 21.

disloyalty in provoking the controversy of succession, which might explain why there were not any defences of the women's rule favoured by Elizabeth.

Apart from the factors of the question of succession, the fact that the Queen had her own style of defining her rule, different from the frame of her apologists, might also explain why they did not get her direct support. As shown by Elizabeth's coronation entry and public speeches, the Queen was keener on fashioning her rule in people's love and God's support than stressing her right of inheritance, on which the writers laid much weight. More obviously as her rule progressed and her position secured, the importance of her lawful hereditary right decreased and the Queen showed even less interest in claiming her right to rule.

Elizabeth did not choose the pragmatic resolution suggested by the defenders of the queen's rule. Instead, she made use of her own art of rhetoric to keep herself out of and above the debate on the female sex or female rulership. She disliked any discussion in defining her authority in terms of gender; she rather loved to view herself as a powerful king, as she spoke imperiously to her parliament that "it is my power to call parliaments, in my power to dissolve them, in my power to give assent or dissent to any determination which they should form."¹⁴⁷ However, if we compare this statement with John Aylmer's suggestion in his treatise that the queen's rule is supervised by laws and she "maketh no statutes or lawes, but the honerable court of Parliament," Aylmer's ideas might be very insulting to Elizabeth. This is not to suggest that Elizabeth was not aware of her sex as a potential weakness in her

¹⁴⁷ *The Sayings of Queen Elizabeth*, 143.

rule, but for Elizabeth, gender is more of a useful tool in utilising her political rhetoric than an authentic impediment in need of justification as Chapter 2 has shown.

Compared with the reign of Mary, the discussion of the queen's rule was more intense in the reign of Elizabeth, probably thanks to John Knox's acrimonious insult in 1558. Those treatises for the defence of Elizabeth's rule not merely stressed subjects' allegiance to the ruler as James Cancellar's *The Path of Obedience* and John Christopherson's *An Exhortation to All Menne to Take Hede and Beward of Rebellion* had done for Mary Tudor. They moved forward to reinforce the legitimacy of gynecocracy and the acceptability of women's rule. Therefore, they enlarged their arguments from the traditional exhortation of obedience to new interpretation of Scripture and a variety of laws, although the duty of obedience was still the main concern.

Strictly speaking, the reign of Mary did not produce any theoretical defence in terms of gynecocracy, neither did it produce any humanist achievement in relation to women's worth and spiritual equality to men. But Elizabethan defences of female sovereignty, particularly the treatises of John Aylmer and Henry Howard, fundamentally assimilated both humanist perception of women's social role and Christians' allegiance to the existing political structure, and furthermore affirmatively grounded the queen's rule in the historical examples. In addition, Elizabeth was

represented as having two bodies, as William Fleetwood's tract argued, a theory which had never been provided by the Marian apologists for their queen.

With regard to the interactions between the writers and the queens, the situation in the reign of Mary Tudor was also different from the reign of Elizabeth. The works of John Christopherson and James Cancellar were officially inspired and dedicated to Queen Mary. Both the Queen and the writers shaped Mary's rule in the same direction to affirm her legitimacy in blood and promote political and religious obedience to the Queen. However, there was an obvious discrepancy between Queen Elizabeth and her apologists in defining her rule, and none of the treatises had been able to win Elizabeth's favour. Elizabeth fashioned her rule in connection with God's special grace and more importantly with people's love and desire, but her apologists managed their discussion more relating to gender terms and concentrating on the woman's succession right—the pragmatic resolution.

Elizabeth perhaps learned from Mary's limitations in her poor performance in her coronation entry and her inflexible insistence on her legitimacy by blood. Elizabeth did not merely assert her hereditary right, but actively participated in the process of redefining her legitimacy, both in her first procession in 1559 and her public speaking afterwards, by repeating the story of her deliverance as a token of God's grace and stimulating people's affection towards her as the foundation of her rule. Yet interestingly, despite the fact that both Queen Mary and Elizabeth had the same natural defect in their political power in respect of their female sex, both of

them chose to evade this topic and ignored (perhaps consciously) any thought about the connection between their gender and power.

Part Three

The Advice on the Queen's Marriage

“But for a Prince, upon whose quiet succession a great part of the commonwealth doth hang, whose family is the root and foundation of inward peace within the realm, to live sole is to be an author of such mischief, as no man can wish to a realm a greater.”

Sir Thomas Smith, *Dialogue on the Queen's Marriage* (1562), 198-99.

Chapter 5

Mary's Spanish Match and English Patriotism

The question of whether marriage was better than celibacy gave rise to fervent debate in the Renaissance. Those humanists who advocated the importance of women's education, such as Erasmus and Thomas More, declared a married life to be a more worthy social and spiritual state than celibacy for women as well as for men. Humanists believed that marriage was the less precarious course for a woman because it put the wife's youth and sex under her husband's control, and "the responsibilities of a family give little space to idleness."¹ Humanists suggested that matrimony not only represented the chief source of happiness, but also brought greater honour through its contribution to society and humanity. As Erasmus stated, "in married women, according to the Apostle, lies the honour of bearing children and taking charge of their religious education, in reward for which (lest it seem to you a matter of small moment) he promised eternal salvation. In this regard virginity certainly gives way to marriage."² The value and sanctity of married life as a preferable state thus came to be one of the key ideas of English humanist social

¹ Erasmus, *The Christian Widow*, in *Erasmus on Woman*, ed. Erika Rummel (Toronto: Toronto University Press, 1996), 191. Erasmus also wrote several colloquies to question the superiority of celibacy to matrimony, including "The Girl with No Interest in Marriage," "Courtship," and "The Repentant Girl." See *The Colloquies of Erasmus*, trans. Craig R. Thompson (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965).

² Ibid.

thought.³ It was continually advanced by sixteenth-century reformers and scholars, like John Bale, declaring that "Christ alloweth mariage in all man and in all tymes."⁴

However, the question of whether marriage was preferable to virginity became rather more complex when it was applied to the ruling queen's marriage: if the queen remained a virgin, she threatened dynastic continuity; but if she married a native Englishman, internal strife would damage her throne, or if she married a foreign prince, the interests of her consort could endanger her native country, given the fact that marriage put women under their husbands' control. Thomas Smith clearly demonstrates this controversy in his *Dialogue on the Queen's Marriage* in 1560, in which three speakers argue for and against the queen's marriage. One of the speakers, Mr. Agamus, citing the Pauline teachings in the New Testament, declares that "virginity is above matrimony," and suggests that the queen should remain chaste and thus lead a peaceful life for herself and her country:

I have declared unto you that simple sole life and virginity doth please God better, and is better esteemed, and an higher virtue than marriage: and as it is more heroical, more comely for a Queen, which is a Monarch and a sovereign Prince born. I have also proved, that for her person, it is most sure, and less dangerous; for her mind, more quiet, and less doubtful: and lastly, you see I lack no reasons to shew, that it is better and more commodious for the realm.⁵

³ Merry E. Wiesner, *Women and Gender in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 22.

⁴ Cited in Patricia Crawford, *Women and Religion in England 1500-1720* (London: Routledge, 1993), 39.

⁵ Thomas Smith, *Dialogue on the Queen's marriage*, in John Strype, *The Life of the Learned Sir Thomas Smith*, Appendix III (Oxford, 1820), 194-95. This tract was probably written to promote Robert Dudley's courtship. Although not printed at that time, it appeared in many manuscript copies and seemed to have a wide circulation. See Susan Doran, *Monarchy and Matrimony: the Courtship of Elizabeth I* (London: Routledge, 1996), 52.

Nevertheless, should a queen remain a virgin, she would be unable to fulfil the principal obligation of all queens—to produce an heir to the throne (ideally a male heir)—and the dynastic succession would hence become uncertain. Another two speakers in Smith's *Dialogue*, Mr. Lovealien and Mr. Homefriend, therefore advocate that the queen should take a husband for the sake of succession and the comfort of herself and the realm. However, Mr. Lovealien, who supports a foreign match, points out that the choice of a native noble threatens to provoke national unrest and stirs rivalry amongst factions and nobles. Mr Homefriend, in contrast, argues that marriage to a foreign prince, though of equal rank, undermines political stability in a different way. He indicates that a foreign husband would love his own natural country better and he would “covet to enrich that, and to impoverish ours; to honour and exalt that, though it be with the oppressing of this.” The husband would not only bring in the manners and law of his own country, but also attempt to bring the queen to accept them, “and so to frame her Majesty, . . . to his bow, which he thinketh best; not to apply to our institutes, conditions, and manners, which be best indeed.”⁶

Indeed, the danger of a foreign match had become one of the obstacles for Mary's and Elizabeth's succession to the throne. In Hugh Latimer's sermon preached in 1549 before King Edward VI, he warned of the danger that if either Mary or Elizabeth, both heirs to the crown, married a foreign prince, then a foreigner might thereby come to wield the English sceptre:

⁶ Thomas Smith, *Dialogue*, 236-37.

O. what a plague were it, said, (by occasion of that passage of Moses, *Thou must not set a stranger over thee*,) that a strange king, of a strange land, and of a strange religion, should reign over us! Where now we be governed in the true religion, he would extirp and pluck away all together, and then plant again all abomination and Popery. . . . Well. the King's Grace hath sisters, my Lady Mary and my Lady Elizabeth, which by succession and course are inheritors to the crown; who if the should marry with strangers, what should ensue God knoweth. But God grant, if they so do, whereby strange religion may come in, that they never come to coursing nor succeeding.

So if they would marry foreigners, Latimer wished that they never should succeed to the crown.⁷ For those Edwardian Protestants, a genuine fear was that Mary's stiff Catholic inclination might bring in a foreign Catholic king to uphold a religious alteration. This underlying anxiety about a ruling queen's marriage still haunted the English people after the accession of Queen Mary. English Protestants, in particular, strongly objected to the Spanish alliance on considerations of religion and national independence, apprehending that the Queen's wifely status would put England at risk of alien Catholic domination. Controversy concerning the queen's marriage therefore increasingly challenged the stability of Mary's reign and demanded that the Queen and her supporters justify their choice.

Chapter 3 has examined how the marriage negotiations with Spain stimulated the establishment of the queen's regal power and institutionalisation of the female monarchy. The present chapter will first investigate how Queen Mary formulated her own arguments regarding marriage and her decision for a Spanish match, in order to alleviate the people's opposition and apprehension. Several historical works have

⁷ Cited in John Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials, relating chiefly to religion and the reformation of it, and the emergencies of the church of England, under King Henry VIII, King Edward VI and Queen Mary I*, III, i (Oxford, 1822), 206.

recounted the process of Mary's marriage negotiations between ambassadors and the emperor, and between the Queen and her councillors, such as E. Harris Harbison's *Rival Ambassadors at the Court of Queen Mary* (1940) and D. M. Loades' "The Spanish Marriage" in *The Reign of Mary Tudor* (1979).⁸ However, Mary's predicament as a private wife and public queen and her own role in those negotiations have been neglected by most modern scholars. To what extent was her choice of a husband influenced by her councillors or by other persons? How did she construct an argument for choosing a foreign husband? Finding answers to these questions will help us understand the Queen's self-perception and self-representation.

This chapter, secondly, will inspect the writings of "mirror-for-queens" which bolstered the Queen's choice and criticised those uprisings that opposed the Spanish match. Catholic apologies for the Queen's marriage, such as John Proctor's *The History of Wyatt's Rebellion* (1554) and John Christopherson's *An Exhortation to All Menne to Take Hede of Rebellion* (1554), have been paid scant attention in modern study of Mary's reign, much less viewed as significant texts in building the righteousness of Mary's decision for her Spanish alliance. In particular, Christopherson's tract is indeed the most notable work concerning the fashioning of Mary's rule. About half of his tract expounds Mary's religious virtues and the subjects' duty of obedience, which has been discussed in previous parts in this thesis. The rest of his work devotes to a defence of Mary's marriage with the Prince of

⁸ E. Harris Harbison, *Rival Ambassadors at the Court of Queen Mary* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1940); D. M. Loades, *The Reign of Mary Tudor: Politics, Government, and Religion in England, 1553-1558* (London: Ernest Benn, 1979).

Spain from several perspectives. It is indeed the most extensive apology for Mary's matrimonial policy.

Finally, this chapter will examine how the issue of the Queen's marriage continued to be explored by the Protestant pamphleteers after the Spanish match was concluded in July 1554, focusing on the Protestants' strategy of manufacturing the notion of Spanish oppression in order to frustrate the Spanish political and religious ambitions. The purpose of the present chapter is not only to elucidate the ideas articulated by Catholic apologists and Protestant dissidents, but also to compare their thoughts with each other and with the Queen's own arguments. Taken as a whole, it means to inspect the extent of the influence exerted by the Queen's gender, the religious strife, and the sentiment of English nationhood in the discourse on Mary's Spanish match.

I. The Queen's will and her free choice

Not long after Mary succeeded to the throne in 1553, her councillors began to suggest that the Queen take a husband.⁹ Yet Mary herself protested on several occasions that she had no personal desire to marry, claiming that "as a private individual she would never have desired it, but preferred to end her days in chastity."¹⁰ It is difficult to decide how genuine this statement was, even though

⁹ Almost all Mary's councillors, within and without England, agreed that Mary should marry, except Cardinal Pole. Unusually, he was prepared to suggest that Mary should remain unmarried and leave the affairs of succession to "take their course." *CSP Ven.*, V, 464.

¹⁰ The Ambassadors in England to the Emperor, 2 August 1553, *CSP Sp.*, XI, 132.

some scholars, like Harbison, believe Mary was always honest.¹¹ Perhaps Mary's statement was a strategy to display her personal sacrifice for the common welfare, as Elizabeth would have done. Thus, on the one hand, Mary could continue to claim that she was willing to marry "for the good of the country," but on the other hand, could maintain that "it was contrary to her own inclination."¹² More possibly, having had a traditional upbringing and humanist education, Mary's willingness to remain a virgin simply exhibited the demanded virtue of chastity which did not differentiate between women in general and a ruling queen. Therefore, Mary's declaration was also a means to represent her womanly virtue. She was also aware that her marriage was not for her own pleasure, but for the welfare of her realm. She was deeply conscious of the difference between the "private individual" and the "public personage."¹³ As the former, she was a chaste woman and would never desire a husband, yet as the latter, she was a ruling queen and was determined to follow her civil and divine calling. Only by declaring her personal inclination to remain a virgin and at the same time her willingness to marry for the sake of the country, could she adapt to her double role and accomplish both the virtue of chastity and public duty at once.

Marriage would indeed grant practical advantage to Mary, for her first concern was the restoration of the old religion in England, which would require the advice and help of a husband with strong Catholic support. Additionally, both the

¹¹ Harbison, *Rival Ambassadors*, 66.

¹² Renard to the Emperor, 16 August 1553, *CSP Sp.*, XI, 171.

¹³ The Ambassadors in England to the Emperor, 2 August 1553, *CSP Sp.*, XI, 132.

kingdom's salvation and tranquillity seemed to depend upon her bearing a child, since neither of the two other claimants was suitable: her sister Elizabeth was known to have heretical leanings and her cousin Mary Stuart, though a Catholic, was betrothed to the Dauphin of France and therefore dominated by the French.¹⁴ Accordingly, Mary saw marriage as her princely duty, and demonstrated repeatedly that she determined to marry only for the sake of posterity, and "thus safeguarding the welfare and tranquillity of the realm."¹⁵

According to the report of the Spanish ambassador, Simon Renard, Mary had actually agreed to choose a life of marriage in October 1553, and she styled the reason for her decision as a princely duty:

she had not desired matrimony, but as God had called her to the throne and she had sworn to serve her country's interests, she had made up her mind to marry and choose a husband who should be able to provide for her kingdom's welfare and tranquillity. If her Council had the same sentiment she believed that as her reign had begun well, so it might continue still better.¹⁶

Consequently, the issue concerning the Queen's marriage in the beginning of her reign was not whether Mary should marry or not, but whom she should marry: a fellow-countryman or a foreigner.

There were at least seven candidates mentioned in 1553, but only two were real possibilities: Edward Courtenay and Philip of Spain. Accordingly, Mary's council

¹⁴ Harbison, *Rival Ambassadors*, 66.

¹⁵ Mary to the King of Romans, November 1553, *CSP Sp.*, XI, 360. For similar statements see Renard to the Emperor, 6 November 1553, *CSP Sp.*, XI, 337, "the queen had decided to marry solely for the hope of obtaining heirs and the welfare of the kingdom." And the same to the same, 17 November 1553, 364, the Queen said that "although it was contrary to her own inclination she would conquer her own feelings as the welfare and tranquillity of her kingdom were in question."

¹⁶ Renard to the Emperor, 15 October 1553, *CSP Sp.*, XI, 295.

was split up into two parties to support each candidate.¹⁷ Each of the two sides put forward different arguments. The supporters of a native match, led by Stephen Gardiner, the Lord Chancellor and the Bishop of Winchester, recommended that Mary should marry Courtenay, the son of Mary's old supporter, the Marquis of Exeter. They begged the Queen to consider "the good of the realm," and to accept this match which "would be most welcome to the people, for no foreigner had ever before been king of the country, and the very name of stranger was odious."¹⁸ Courtenay's qualifications were that he was a Catholic and compatriot, and had suffered persecution under Henry VIII; more importantly, he carried the royal blood of the house of York. He was indeed favoured by the majority of Mary's people, including a large number of the members of Parliament and of the middle classes who shaped public opinion in Tudor England.¹⁹ On the other side, the party which was in favour of a foreign match, led by William, Lord Paget, suggested to the Queen

¹⁷ This thesis, agreeing with Simon Adams's strict definition of "faction," uses the term "party," instead of "faction," to refer to the conflict between two different groups of councillors or two leaders in the queens' councils. According to Simon Adams, "a faction was a personal following employed in direct opposition to another personal following. A faction struggle could involve disputes over patronage or debate over matters of state, but its essence was a personal rivalry that over-rode all other considerations." The conflict in Mary's Council over the issue of the Queen's marriage was certainly not the case. In fact, under Adams's definition, faction struggles only emerged in two periods in English politics: the middle years of Edward VI's reign (1548 to 1552) and the 1590s. See Simon Adams, "Faction, Clientage, and Party: English Politics, 1550-1603," *History Today* 32 (1982):34. More see his "Eliza Enthroned? The Court and Its Politics," in *The Reign of Elizabeth I*, ed. Christopher Haigh (London: Macmillan, 1984), 55-77; "Favourites and Factions at the Elizabethan Court," in *Princes, Patronage, and the Nobility: The Court at the Beginning of the Modern Age*, eds. Ronald G. Asch and Adolf M. Burke (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 265-87.

¹⁸ Renard to the Emperor, 21 October 1553, *CSP Sp.*, XI, 310. For a summary of Gardiner's reasons for opposing the foreign match, see Glyn Redworth, *In Defence of the Church Catholic: The Life of Stephen Gardiner* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990), 290-300.

¹⁹ Harbison, *Rival Ambassadors*, 58.

that only if she chose "a puissant and exalted husband," rather than Courtenay or some poor Prince, could England "enjoy security and repose."²⁰

The division in Mary's council was based partly on religion and primarily on political attitudes and diplomatic policies.²¹ Gardiner's party was composed mostly of Mary's household servants who had been faithful to her in adversity. Most of them were devoted Catholics, zealous in restoring the old religion, but few of them were possessed of any political experience. Paget's party consisted of those nobles and civil servants with more flexible religious attitudes, most of whom had served under the reign of Edward VI; *politiques* might be a suitable term to describe these pragmatic statesmen. With regard to their diplomatic policies, the party of Gardiner was earnestly patriotic, with strong aversion to all foreign influence except allegiance to Rome. The policy of Gardiner's party was compatible with the interests of Henry II, the King of France, who feared that a Spanish match would drive England into the Habsburg camp. Nevertheless, Gardiner's party was greatly cautious with regard to French support because of their basic principle of refusing any foreign intervention. Paget, on the other hand, was convinced that England was too weak to stand alone; a foreign match therefore was desirable as a means of placing a protective mantle

²⁰ Renard to the Emperor, 15 October 1553, *CSP Sp.*, XI, 295.

²¹ Mary was comparatively weak in relation to her Privy Council, which was made up of a mixture of Mary's old household servants, Edwardian councillors and civil servants and some complete outsiders. For a list of councillors see Loades, *The Reign of Mary Tudor*, 474-80. Conflict and confusion molested Mary's Council to a extreme extent since it was formed. Simon Renard reported in 1554 that "quarrels, jealousy and ill-will have increased among the Councillors, becoming so public that several of them, out of spite, no longer attend the meetings. What one does, another undoes; that one advises, another opposes; one strives to save Courtenay, another Elizabeth." The conflict between the two parties was so obvious and public that Renard prophesied that "if her Council continued to be split up into two factions it would be impossible to avoid some scandalous disorder," and the Queen might need to surround herself with troops. *CSP Sp.*, XII, 220.

around the realm. If England had to choose between France and Spain, Paget believed that Spain, as a traditional ally since the time of Mary's grandfather, would be a stronger defensive league, restraining French intrigue of claims to the English throne through Mary Stuart's marriage with the French Dauphin. The position of Paget's party was certainly compatible with the Emperor Charles V's interests to eliminate French influence in the Habsburg dominions and the British Isles. Lord Paget therefore gained strong support from the Emperor and his ambassadors, Simon Renard in particular.

However, both parties as well as foreign ambassadors were faced with the hard work of winning two hearts: the Queen's will and the people's support. Undoubtedly, Mary's personal inclination was consequential to the decision of native match or foreign alliance. It soon became clear that Mary herself had no intention of marrying Courtenay, despite passionate support for this candidate from the majority of the people. Moreover, she was emotionally more and more attracted by the young and handsome Prince of Spain under the persuasion of Simon Renard.²² However, even though supporters on both sides agreed that the Queen's own will should be seriously respected, it was ambiguous to what extent the Queen had full freedom to determine her own marriage.

On one occasion, Simon Renard discussed the question of Mary's marriage with Stephen Gardiner, stating that "all this depended upon the Queen's inclinations,

²² See Loades, *The Reign of Mary Tudor*, 110-11 and his *Mary Tudor: A Life* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989), 200-01; Harbison, *Rival Ambassadors*, 57-58, 80.

which ought to be free.” He argued that “every one who had discussed the question of her marriage agreed that her choice ought to be free. Such was the custom of princes, and must certainly be that of princes and princesses of the Queen’s exalted rank and lineage.”²³ Renard’s statement should not however be treated too sincerely, since he already knew that Mary had made up her mind to marry a foreign prince when he stated that.²⁴ Gardiner, despite his own inclination, agreed with Renard and indicated that he would respect the Queen’s own choice in this conversation with Renard.

Nevertheless, proponents of a native match were rather less supportive of the Queen’s free choice of marriage when they found that the Queen’s heart was bent upon the Spanish Prince. They raised the people’s will, as the threat to her rule, in objection to Mary’s choice. Gardiner, in his conversation with Queen Mary in November 1553, first assured Mary that “the Queen’s inclination ought to be the first consideration, and the one that should guide him.” But immediately after he heard that Mary had made her choice to marry outside the kingdom, he abruptly responded, “what will the people say? How will they put up with a foreigner, who will promise things he will not keep once the marriage had been concluded?”²⁵ He warned Mary

²³ Renard to the Emperor, 6 November 1553, *CSP Sp.*, XI, 339.

²⁴ In fact, Queen Mary had decided to accept the marriage proposal on 28 October 1553, and Renard reported that “the Queen has given me to understand that she wishes the marriage to be consummated as soon as possible.” Renard to Prince Philip, 29 October 1553, *CSP Sp.*, XI, 326. And in the following day, she swore on the sacrament to marry the Prince of Spain in the present of Renard. Renard to the Emperor, 31 October 1553, *CSP Sp.*, XI, 328.

²⁵ Renard to the Emperor, 6 November 1553, *CSP Sp.*, XI, 342-43.

at another time that “the people would be displeased, because they and the nobility wished the opposite to happen.”²⁶

How the people's will or popular opinion in Tudor England was formed and manipulated by certain groups of people is indeed difficult to define. Generally the popular opinion was that expressed by the social and economic elite in the middle classes, yet there was still a certain space for government, nobles and ambassadors to shape the popular attitude. Basically, Gardiner was right in his conviction that the majority of English people desired a native match, instead of a foreign prince. Renard's report in September 1553 confirmed the same trend of the popular opinion. He pointed out that the majority of the English people preferred Courtenay to be the Queen's husband and he therefore found “serious difficulties in the way of negotiating a foreign match.”²⁷ He, in the same report, also revealed an overt expression of English xenophobia, which came out before the marriage negotiations with Philip started, as when M. de Guzmán in an assembly of Englishmen declared Mary's marriage with the Archduke Ferdinand, second son of the Emperor's brother, “the English were very angry with him and ill-pleased because he had mentioned a foreign marriage.”²⁸ Indeed, throughout the whole course of the marriage negotiations, the Spanish ambassador and Lord Paget always had to struggle to deflect English patriotism.

²⁶ Renard to the Emperor, 17 November 1553, *CSP Sp.*, XI, 363-64.

²⁷ Renard to the Emperor, 4 September 1553, *CSP Sp.*, XI, 202.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 203.

Popular opinion, however, was the best card for Gardiner and the French ambassador, François de Noailles, to thwart the Spanish match. They even conducted a campaign to deepen English hatred of foreigners, Spaniards in particular, and to reinforce people's apprehension regarding Spanish domination. Renard indicated that the French ambassador, co-operating with Gardiner, "painted the Spaniards in the darkest colours that he could devise; he impress it upon them [the Englishmen] that if the alliance were to take place the Spaniards would try to dominate in England; said they were hated by the whole world, that they were unbearable and much more besides in the same strain to decry the Spanish nation."²⁹ Furthermore, there were several pamphlets circulating in the streets of London and in Parliament between September and October 1553. These probably originated with Noailles and Gardiner, warning Englishmen of the Emperor's perfidiousness and the horrors of Habsburg rule in other parts of Europe.³⁰ The people's patriotism was therefore fostered; some resolved never to become subject to a Spanish prince and were even prepared to rise up against him. This expression of anti-Spanish sentiment seemed to form the early basis for "the black legend" in England.³¹

The party which supported the native match thus connected itself deliberately with the voice of the people to compel the Queen to marry an Englishman. However, Mary herself seemed to disregard the people's will and to be rather keen on the idea

²⁹ Renard to the Emperor, 5 October 1553, *CSP Sp.*, XI, 268.

³⁰ Harbison, *Rival Ambassadors*, 79-80.

³¹ See William S. Maltby, *The Black Legend in England: The Development of Anti-Spanish Sentiment, 1558-1660* (Durham, NC.: Duke University Press, 1971). The anti-Spanish sentiment was later greatly furthered by Protestant pamphleteers, which will be discussed in the final section of this chapter.

that "her choice is free," as free as all the previous kings of England. She responded to Gardiner's stress on popular desire that "when the kings had been in childhood they had been given liberty in questions of marriage, wherefore they ought always to enjoy the same."³² Furthermore, she expressed anger at those who would force her to marry someone far from her liking. She believed that a marriage of that sort would cause her death, for "if she were married against *her will* she would not live three months, and would have no children."³³ Ultimately, she gave her great councillor a clear choice between her will and the people's will, stating that if Gardiner "preferred the will of the people to her wishes, he was not acting towards her as he had always promised to act."³⁴

Mary fully lost her image as a careful ruler in this confrontation with the people's will. She reacted unskilfully and incompatibly with her own promise that she would marry for the benefit of the people. She paid little attention to winning the support of the majority of her people and seemed to underestimate the possibility that English patriotism and the people's discontent could lead to rebellions. At this stage, Mary's predicament was no longer a contradiction between her desire to stay a virgin and the country's interests, but dissension between the people's will (a native match) and her own will (a foreign husband). However, it is too simplistic to view her will as either a result of her free mind in choosing a husband or as a straightforward strategy for her religious restoration. First, Mary's natural intimacy with the Spanish,

³² Renard to the Emperor, 17 November 1553, *CSP Sp.*, XI, 364.

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Renard to the Emperor, 6 November 1553, *CSP Sp.*, XI, 343.

engendered from her Spanish blood, is a primary fact that should not be underestimated. Secondly, it seemed to Mary that her marriage with Philip II of Spain, renewing the Anglo-Spanish alliance initiated by her father, Henry VIII, would reinforce the legitimacy of her parents' marriage which was denied by her father and the Church of England in 1534.³⁵ Finally, a pivotal cause for Mary to decide her marriage with Philip lay in her emotional dependence on the Emperor.

A great deal of evidence based on Renard's and Mary's letters to Charles V shows that she had an inflexible affinity to the Emperor and that her argument for her choice was substantially based upon his instruction. As Charles's cousin, Mary's dependence on the Emperor had a long history. As early as six years of age, Mary had been placed at the very centre of a complicated diplomatic game wielded between Henry VIII and Charles V. Mary's marriage became the most convenient cement of the Anglo-Spanish league in the 1520s to restrain the ambition of Francis I, King of France. The proposed bridegroom was Charles himself, sixteen years older than Mary, and he visited the Princess during his second visit to England in June 1522.³⁶ Eventually this marriage negotiation came to nothing because Charles could not wait for the Princess to attain the lawful age to consecrate their marriage and he had already begun to court Isabella of Portugal by 1525. However, Charles and Mary continued to exchange letters.

³⁵ For Mary's deep concern as to the validity of her parents' marriage see Chapter 3, section I.

³⁶ Loades, *Mary Tudor*, 23.

Marriage was Charles's most frequently used tactic to increase his dominions and influence; he always saw Mary as one of the most effective instruments for his intervention in English and European affairs. He even proposed a marriage negotiation for Mary on behalf of Dom Luis of Portugal in 1537 in order to involve Henry VIII in a league against France.³⁷ For Mary, Charles was a close kinsman, and he had become her strongest ally in the fight against religious alteration during the English Reformation in the reigns of her father and brother. In the beginning of Edward VI's reign, Charles guided Mary in dealing with the controversy between her and the council over the question of mass in her household and her religious nonconformity. During this crisis, according to Spanish ambassador Van der Delft's report, Mary reiterated that the Emperor was her only solace and support: "her life and her salvation are in your Majesty's keeping."³⁸ Afterwards, Mary deferred in almost everything to Charles's instruction and discretion.

In respect of the question of marriage after her accession to the throne, she still looked up to the Emperor and on many occasions asserted that she would follow Charles's suggestion regarding her marriage and in all other matters entirely. More significantly, she considered herself "incapable of managing this affair by herself without risking her position and exposing her person to danger."³⁹ Renard reported emphatically to the Emperor about the Queen's reliance on him:

she was determined to follow your advice, and choose whomsoever you might recommend; for after God she desired to obey none but your Majesty,

³⁷ Ibid., 108-09, 123.

³⁸ Van der Delft to the Emperor, 30 March 1549, *CSP Sp.*, IX, 350.

³⁹ Renard to the Emperor, 12 October 1553, *CSP Sp.*, XI, 290-91.

whom she regarded as a father, . . . for as she was marrying against her private inclination she trusted your Majesty would give her a suitable match. . . . she would submit herself to your Majesty's decision as to her marriage and all other matters.⁴⁰

Renard also further assured Charles V that,

If you were to urge her to marry it could not be taken otherwise than in good part, and were the Council to fix on some match that did not please your Majesty she would devise good means of setting aside their resolution.

She would never. . . think of marrying without your Majesty knowing her intentions before her own confessor, for after God there was no one for whom she had so much respect.⁴¹

Correspondingly, Mary fully believed that Charles would always act like a good father towards her, before or after their alliance. In her letter to Charles after enunciating her decision, Mary affectingly appreciated Charles's "paternal solicitude" towards her, for he was ever remaining her "good lord and father."⁴² It was clear that Mary indeed viewed Charles as a father and a guide of her marital and political affairs. She seemed, consciously or unconsciously, to look for a "father," a parental authority, to sanction her marriage. Perhaps, influenced by her traditional upbringing, she viewed parental consent as essential in deciding children's marriage and thought it unseemly for a woman herself to bring about this issue. Consequently she asked Charles V through Renard to write letters to some of her councillors about her marriage so that she would be able to speak to them and find out their wishes and objections.⁴³

⁴⁰ Renard to the Emperor, 2 August 1553, *CSP Sp.*, XI, 132.

⁴¹ Renard to the Emperor, 12 October 1553, *CSP Sp.*, XI, 290, 292.

⁴² Mary to the Emperor, 1 December 1553, *CSP Sp.*, XI, 407.

⁴³ Renard to the Emperor, 12 October 1553, *CSP Sp.*, XI, 289-90.

Mary was not only deferential to Charles's recommendation, but also armed with the reasons and arguments provided by his ambassador.⁴⁴ However, not revealing her unshakeable attachment to Charles to her dissident councillors and members of the parliament, Mary defended her choice by another spiritual father—God, the divine inspiration. For instance, on 6 November, when Stephen Gardiner conversed with Mary about her choice,

The Queen, who was already instructed and had made up her mind, replied to the Chancellor that for the last week she had been sorely afflicted, had prayed to God and cried out to be inspired. She could not bring herself to marry within the kingdom, rather than do which she would never marry at all, but remain in her present state all her life long.⁴⁵

Similarly, as she told a delegation of parliament, “all her affairs had been conducted by divine disposition, so she would pray God to counsel and inspire her in her choice of a husband,” and the result of divine inspiration was to marry the Prince of Spain.⁴⁶ Under the surface of Mary's assertion of free choice and God's inspiration was actually Charles's will. It was the Emperor's mind rather than Mary's free mind which made the decision regarding Mary's marriage. In other words, the conflict between the Queen's will and people's will was only ostensible, and Mary's real predicament was the dissension between the English people's will and the Emperor's will.

⁴⁴ There was a memorial sent by Renard to Mary for her to put forward her course. See, *CSP Sp.*, XI, 300-02. Mary relied greatly on Renard as her second father confessor. See Renard to the Emperor, 28 October 1553, *CSP Sp.*, XI, 320.

⁴⁵ Renard to the Emperor, 6 November 1553, *CSP Sp.*, XI, 342.

⁴⁶ Renard to the Emperor, 17 November 1553, *CSP Sp.*, XI, 364. For the relationship between Mary and her first parliament (beginning on 5 October 1553), see Jennifer Loach, *Parliament and the Crown in the Reign of Mary Tudor* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), 74-90.

II. The Queen and the people's will

Although Queen Mary paid little heed to the people's will during the discussion regarding the choice of her husband, she was not completely unaware of her people's anxiety about Spanish domination. After 10 October 1553 when Renard gave the Queen the first proposal of Philip's courtship, she gradually discerned the need to deal with the conflict between her choice (or the emperor's will) and her people's wishes. She had to balance these two opinions in order to confirm her Spanish alliance and sustain the country's tranquillity. This political reality not only prompted her to actively support the legislation of the queen's regal power as Chapter 3 has shown, but also forced her to explore a new language which could satisfy both the private female virtue of modesty and submission and her public royal supremacy. As she told Renard on 12 October 1553,

She would wholly love and obey him [Philip] to whom she had given herself, following the divine commandment, and would do nothing against his will; but if he wished to encroach in the government of the kingdom, she would be unable to permit it, nor if he attempted to fill posts and offices with strangers, for the country itself would never stand such interference.⁴⁷

Mary, in the first part of her speech, affirmed her wifely obedience as society expected.⁴⁸ Yet, in the second part, she initiated a political relationship between a

⁴⁷ Renard to the Emperor, 12 October 1553, *CSP Sp.*, XI, 289-90.

⁴⁸ In this age, the husband's authority not only emphatically increased in law, but was also stressed in marriage manuals and many religious and political writings. Wiesner, *Women and Gender*, 22, 59-60.

ruling queen and her consort, suggesting that there would be no husband's interposition in public affairs and she would only submit to him in private affairs.

Mary assured further the same attitude in December by declaring that "whatsoever husbands may otherwise persuade their wives, if this marriage should take place, . . . God would never suffer her to forget her other promise made to her first husband on the day of her coronation."⁴⁹ Noteworthy here is her reference to England as her "first husband" and her declaration that she would always take care of England's welfare as a loyal wife, even if she married a man from another country. In addition, the way Mary responded to French uneasiness about her marriage is also notable. She told the French ambassador that "she still remained of the self same mind as heretofore, from which neither husband, father, kinsman, nor any other person alive should, . . . cause her to change," so she would remain the regal authority in her own, not in Philip.⁵⁰

Mary's assurance and the efforts of Renard and Lord Paget in mollifying the opposition in the Council finally pushed the Council to accept the Queen's Spanish match. The marriage contract between Queen Mary and Philip was signed on 12 January 1554.⁵¹ On 14 January, the Lord Chancellor formally declared the Queen's determination and summarised the content of this contract:

we were moche bounden to thanck God that so noble, worthye, and famouse a prince woulde vouchsaff so to humble himself, as in this maryadge to take

⁴⁹ The Council to Dr. Wotton, 7 December 1553, *CSP For.*, 35.

⁵⁰ The Council to Dr. Wotton, 23 December 1553, *CSP For.*, 40.

⁵¹ Renard to the Emperor, 13 January 1554, *CSP Sp.*, XII, 23. For the articles and treaty of this marriage see "Announcing Articles of Marriage with Philip of Spain," in *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, II, 21-26.

apon him rather as a subject then otherwise; and that the quene shoulde rule all thinges as she dothe nowe; and that ther should be of the counsell no Spanyard, nether should have the custody of any forts or castelles; nether bere rule of offyce in the quenes house, or elsewhere in all England.⁵²

His speech demonstrated that Philip's status as a king consort would be little more than that of a "subject." He had to leave "the whole disposition of all the benefits and offices, lands, revenues, . . ." to his wife.⁵³ Mary's pre-eminence in English affairs was clearly affirmed.

However, in spite of these assurances, the contemporary notions of husband/wife relationship were such that few believed that, once married, Mary could continue to function as a fully autonomous monarch. As the French scholar Jean Bodin indicated, many people at the time were of the opinion that "the rights and revenues of the kingdom belong to him [Philip], although the kingdom and sovereign authority over it inherits in the queen."⁵⁴ It was widely presumed that Queen Mary would relinquish her own independence in the Spanish match, and Philip would be the *de facto* ruler of the kingdom. That is to say, her status of wifely inferiority would extend to the realm she governed, the land and autonomy of England might be absorbed by the Habsburgs.

This situation revealed that the Queen's gender made people's fear of Spanish domination strikingly prevalent and sensitive. It was true that a prince's marriage

⁵² *Queen Jane and Queen Mary*, 35

⁵³ *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, II, 21.

⁵⁴ Jean Bodin, *Six Books of the Commonwealth*, trans. M. J. Tooley (Oxford: Blackwell, 1955), 203. Although a Frenchman, Bodin paid much heed to English affairs and was emphatically against female rule. Moreover, in 1571, before his work published in 1576, he entered the household of the French King's brother, François, duc d'Alençon, as master of requests and councillor. He also came with Alençon to England to visit the court of Elizabeth.

might also cause anxiety about foreign influence: James I's plan to marry his heir to a Spanish princess created fear that "a fecund Infanta could well draw England into the 'empire' just as earlier Habsburg princes had done in the Netherlands and in Spain itself."⁵⁵ Nevertheless, only a ruling queen's marriage produced this scale of collective apprehension among the English people. They suspected that if the husband ruled the queen in marriage, he would rule over her subjects, and that if the queen died, the husband might take over the throne. Furthermore, the undertone of English patriotism exacerbated this fear. English xenophobic prejudices seemed to have been common in this age, but historians do not have sufficient sources to make definite conclusions. Nevertheless, the Spanish ambassadors' reports make several mentions about Englishmen's hatred of foreigners and "it is generally supposed that a foreign alliance will be difficult to negotiate because foreigners are disliked in England."⁵⁶ In addition, the reports of the French ambassador, Noailles, also indicated that popular suspicion of foreign influence was worthy of manipulation in order to frustrate Philip's courtship.⁵⁷

The strength of patriotism could be discovered in various uprisings after the Queen's marriage was announced. Many plots against the alliance were discovered in November 1553. Some members of the House of Commons and several gentlemen, including Sir Peter Carew, Sir James Croftes, William Winter, Sir

⁵⁵ Thomas Cogswell, "England and the Spanish Match," in *Conflicts in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religions and Politics, 1603-1642*, eds. Richard Cust and Ann Hughes (Harlow Essex: Longman, 1989), 112.

⁵⁶ The Ambassadors in England to the Emperor, 30 September 1553, *CSP Sp.* XI, 263.

⁵⁷ Harbison, *Rival Ambassadors*, 64-65.

Edward Rogers, and Sir Thomas Wyatt, met on 26 November 1553 in London to discuss plans for an uprising. There was also a planned fourfold popular rising from Herefordshire, Kent, Devon and Leicestershire at the end of December.⁵⁸ All the protests culminated in Sir Thomas Wyatt's rebellion, which lasted from the middle of January to 7 February 1554.⁵⁹ The leading figures of these uprisings were "all men of substance and influence," and some of them had held office in Edward's reign or inclined to the new religion. Most of the uprisings planned to have Courtenay marry Elizabeth and allow Elizabeth to displace her sister as the Queen of England.⁶⁰ However, the factor of religion in assembling those insurrections was actually less significant than a sense of English nationhood. Those uprisings gained the local support primarily by making patriotic appeal to the people. As Wyatt's rebellion showed, Wyatt made his proclamation at Maidstone on 25 January 1554 to articulate the essence of his rising as repelling foreigners. After Wyatt's public declaration, "all the nobility of the realm and the whole privy council (one or two only except) were agreeable to his pretended treason," and Thomas Cheyney, Lord Abergavenny, Sir Robert Southwell, the Lord Warden, High Sheriff, "with all other Gentlemen would join with him in this enterprise."⁶¹

⁵⁸ D. M. Loades, *Two Tudor Conspiracies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), 15, 21.

⁵⁹ Concerning the Wyatt's rebellion see *Queen Jane and Queen Mary*, 38-39, 46, 68-71; and D. M. Loades, *Two Tudor Conspiracies*, 47-88. Loades points out that the Wyatt's rebellion "was the only popular insurrection upon an appreciable scale to emerge from a period of intense disturbance and agitation." 48.

⁶⁰ Loades, *Two Tudor Conspiracies*, 16; Harbison, *Rival Ambassadors*, 94, 111.

⁶¹ John Proctor, *The History* (London: R. Caly, 1554, STC 20407), reprinted in E. Arber in *An English Garner, Tudor Tracts 1532-1558*, XIII (London: Archibald Constable and Co., Ltd, 1877-1896), 209.

In fact, from November 1553 to February 1554, all the leaders of rebellions in different areas stated that their uprisings were not a conspiracy against the Queen, but because they could not suffer the country to be oppressed by "strangers." Some observers pointed out that all England (including Catholics and Protestants) would rise in like manner at the same time, "all preferring to die in battle rather than to become subject to a foreign Prince;" and that "it was most certain that the whole people are embittered against the marriage."⁶² In other words, it was anxiety about the future of England under the threat of Spain, rather than Philip's religion, which was widely shared by Mary's subjects and provoked popular support for those uprisings.

It is also important for us to bear in mind that the majority of Mary's subjects were still Catholics; the Reformation in previous reigns did not last long enough to subvert people's belief generally. Moreover, Loades's study of the unrest conspirators, in his *Two Tudor Conspiracies*, has showed that the leaders of those rebellions, besides Thomas Wyatt, were not zealous in religion and all conformed to changes in the established religion and their religious affiliations with Protestantism were "shadowy."⁶³ Therefore, those insurrections and their participants were not primarily influenced by Protestant concerns over Mary's Catholic policies and marriage. Loades, Harbison and Jennifer Loach all agree that the real reasons which lay behind this rising were "secular and political," namely, fear of Spanish

⁶² Peter Vannes to Mary, 18 February 1554, *CSP For.*, 59.

⁶³ Loades, *Two Tudor Conspiracies*, 16.

domination through the Queen's marriage.⁶⁴ In short, those uprisings to a great degree demonstrated the anxiety about foreign domination which had been subtly intensified by the weakness of the Queen's female sex. Rebels like Thomas Wyatt expressed the people's will in a vociferous way and made it clear that the popular suspicion of foreign intervention was the most important obstacle for the Queen in persuading her people to accept her marriage with Philip.

Mary's strategy, contrary to those leaders of rebellions, was to term their uprisings as religious mutiny, rather than a patriotic objection to her Spanish marriage, in order to withdraw the people's support to them. The chance for Mary to address her argument to her subjects came when Wyatt marched towards London on 1 February 1554. She made a vehement oration at Guildhall to arouse Londoners' loyal enthusiasm against those opponents, stating that:

I am come unto you in mine own person, to tell you that, which already you see and know; that is how traitorously and rebelliously a number of Kentishmen have assembled themselves against both us and you. Their pretence (as they said at the first) was for a marriage determined for us. . . . But since, we have caused certain of our privy council to go again unto them, and to demand the cause of their rebellion; and it appeared then unto our said council, that the matter of the marriage seemed to be a Spanish cloak to cover their pretended purpose against our religion; for that they arrogantly and traitorously demanded to have the governance of our person, the keeping of the Tower, and the placing of our councillors.⁶⁵

⁶⁴ Ibid., 88; Harbison, *Rival Ambassadors*, 94, 111, 114; Loach, *Parliament and the Crown*, 225-29. For those scholars who suggest to view religion as an important ingredient in the insurrections, see Conrad Russell, *The Crisis of Parliaments: English History 1509-1660* (London: Oxford University Press, 1971), 139; Anthony Fletcher and Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Tudor Rebellions* (London: Longman, 1997), 90; Malcolm R. Thorp, "Religion and the Wyatt Rebellion of 1554," *Church History* 47 (1978): 363-80.

⁶⁵ Foxe, VI, 414.

Regarding her own marriage, Mary reiterated the metaphor of husband on this occasion:

I am your queen, to whom at my coronation, when I was wedded to the realm and laws of the same (the spousal ring whereof I have on my finger, which never hitherto was, nor hereafter shall be left off), you promised your allegiance and obedience unto me.⁶⁶

Mary, then, demonstrated again that she made this decision wholly based on the duty of the sovereign to produce an heir and the consideration of public benefits:

I have hitherto lived a virgin, and doubt nothing, but with God's grace, I am able so to live still. But if, as my progenitors have done before, it may please God that I might leave some fruit of my body behind me, to be your governor, I trust you would not only rejoice thereat, but also I know it would be to your great comfort. And certainly, if I either did think or know, that this marriage were to the hurt of any of you my commons, or to the impeachment of any part or parcel of the royal state of this realm of England, I would never consent thereunto, neither would I ever marry while I lived.

Being aware of public opposition to the Spanish match, she wisely hinted that she would leave the matter to the arbitration of a parliament, "if it shall not probably appear to all the nobility and commons in the high court of parliament, that this marriage shall be for the high benefit and commodity of the whole realm, then will I abstain from marriage while I live."⁶⁷ Here, she fashioned herself as a queen who, not insisting on her own will, was willing to listen to the people's will.

Her oration indeed satisfied the audience and aroused people's loyalty to the crown. Many of the Londoners lost their sympathy for the rebels.⁶⁸ Mary's words

⁶⁶ Foxe, VI, 414.

⁶⁷ Ibid., 415

⁶⁸ Harbison, *Rival Ambassadors*, 133

might also satisfy people's expectations regarding her wifely obeisance to the realm—her first husband—and to the people's will. The speech displayed Mary's capacity to craft her words in order to alleviate the danger relating to her person and throne. Apart from that, referring to the kingdom as a symbolic husband brought a good example to Queen Elizabeth's rhetoric.

Wyatt's insurrection was defeated finally, and the marriage settlement was ratified by Parliament in April 1554 with other rigid terms which restrained Philip's intervention in the English government.⁶⁹ However, neither the Emperor nor Mary could make people believe that the Spanish would hold to these restrictions. As Lord Windsor asked, after the terms of the formal marriage treaty were revealed, "You tell us many fine words on the part of the Queen and many large promises on the part of the Emperor and his son; but if it happens that they choose not to carry out what they promise, what pledges and assurances will you have of them to compel them to hold by their agreements?"⁷⁰ Ultimately, Mary was never able to answer this question, so the ratified treaty was never able to fully alleviate people's anxiety, nor to lessen their suspicion of Spanish domination in the long run. The Spanish match continued to be controversial throughout Mary's reign, especially between Mary's supporters and her Protestant opponents.

⁶⁹ There were two acts passed in the parliament of April 1554, one which declared a queen's power to be identical to that of a king and another which defined the future relationship between Mary and her husband. They are discussed in Chapter 3, section II. For more also see Loach, *Parliament and the Crown*, 91-104.

⁷⁰ Cited in Harbison, *Rival ambassador*, 103.

III. The defence of the Queen's choice

Wyatt's rebellion and the Queen's victory provoked two important works which were written to defend the Queen's choice of a Spanish alliance and to teach Englishmen a lesson of obedience. The one was John Proctor's *The History of Wyatt's Rebellion* and the other was John Christopherson's *An Exhortation*. Christopherson, the Queen's chaplain, probably wrote his work under official guidance and his book was published by the royal printer, Cawood.⁷¹ The two primary themes in his work are the idea of absolute political obedience to the rulers and the approval of the Queen's choice of marriage. Proctor was also an ardent Catholic clergyman and supporter of Mary. He had already dedicated to Mary, when Princess, a work entitled *The Fall of the Late Arian*, written on Somerset's deposition from the Protectorate. This second work, also dedicated to the Queen, is a historical work recording the process of Wyatt's revolt and failure, compiled from facts supplied by eyewitnesses who accompanied Wyatt's forces. At the same time, it substantially presents the author's view of the queen's marriage.⁷²

Both Christopherson and Proctor defend the Queen's choice, first, by raising suspicion about the motivations of Wyatt's rebellion. Proctor argues that Wyatt's rebellion, which he calls "a most deceitful treason," was indeed a religious uprising. He draws attention to how the rebels coloured their action to be defending from

⁷¹ Jennifer Loach, "The Marian Establishment and the Printing Press," *English Historical Review* 101 (1986): 142.

⁷² There was another account of Wyatt's rebellion written by Edward Underhill, from a different perspective from John Proctor. Underhill's work also republished in *An English Garner*, 170-98; and in *Queen Jane and Queen Mary*, 128-33.

aliens and advancing liberty, "where, in very deed, his only and very matter was the continuance of heresy: as by his own words at sundry times shall hereafter appear."⁷³ He also recounts Wyatt's duplicity regarding his motivations of rebelling. On one occasion, according to Proctor, someone came to ask Wyatt, "Sir, is your quarrel only to defend us from overrunning by Strangers and to advance liberty; and not against the Queen?" To which Wyatt replied "No. . . we mind nothing less than any wise to touch her Grace; but to serve her and honour her, according to our duties." However, on another occasion when another wealthy questioner who supported the Protestant religion, came to speak to Wyatt that "I trust. . . you will restore the right religion again," Wyatt did not repudiate him but replied more honestly (according to Proctor's opinion) that "you may not so much as name religion, for that will withdraw from us the hearts of many. You must only make your quarrel for overrunning by Strangers. And yet to thee, be it said in counsel, as unto my friend, we mind *only* the restitution of GOD's Word. But no words!"⁷⁴

Christopherson in his *An Exhortation* also opines that the cause of foreign oppression was just a pretence made up by rebels to deceive simple people, like "the songs of Sirens." He is convinced that the rebel's genuine intention was to promote Luther's "lewde religion," "which god and the Quenes highnes had lately banished out of the realme"⁷⁵ The two writers' interpretations of Wyatt's intentions are much in accordance with Mary's contention of this rebellion as a religious mutiny. Proctor

⁷³ Proctor, *The History*, 209.

⁷⁴ Ibid., 210.

⁷⁵ John Christopherson, *An Exhortation* (London: J. Cawood, 1554, STC 5207), sig. Bsr, L1v; also see sig. O1, Q8.

and Christopherson adopt the same ideology as Mary and her supporters in the council. They define the rebellion as a plot specifically for the alteration of religion, not for the whole "health and wealth of us all," but to bring about the disturbance of the common wealth.⁷⁶

Furthermore, the Queen's apologists defend the Queen's choice by counteracting the rebels' warning of the Spanish domination. Proctor affiliates himself with Mary's defenders by reprinting Sir Robert Southwell's statement in *the Exhortation*, which emphasises the good will of Spaniards and the comfort which would be brought to England by the Spanish match. It argues that "we know most certainly that there is meant no manner of evil to us by those Strangers; but rather aid profit and comfort against other strangers." By those "other strangers," the *Exhortation* indicates the French who are "ancient enemies, with whom they, as most arrant and degenerate traitors, do indeed unkindly and unnaturally join."⁷⁷ Consequently, Proctor and other supporters of Queen Mary could further accuse Wyatt of not only aiming at the crown, but also, more unforgivably, attempting to "ruin the kingdom and bring in the French."⁷⁸ Proctor reminds people that if those rebels "meant to resist Strangers, as they mind nothing less; they would then be prepared to go to the sea coasts; and not to the Queen's most royal person." He also warned English people emphatically that if they worried about foreign take-over, they should look to French domination behind those rebels rather than to Mary's match

⁷⁶ As showed in Wyatt's Proclamation, see Proctor, *The History*, 212.

⁷⁷ Sir Robert Southwell's *Exhortation*, in Proctor's *History*, 220.

⁷⁸ Renard to the Emperor, 5 February 1554, *CSP Sp.*, XII, 78.

with the Spanish Prince, which he believes will in fact bring comfort and prosperity to the Kingdom.⁷⁹

John Christopherson uses a different strategy from Proctor by proving the alien Prince to be, in fact, a native Englishman. He argues that the Prince of Spain is not a foreigner, "but one of the bloude royall of England, . . . spronge oute of the race of the Kinges of England." He draws a genealogical tree for Philip and Mary, showing that they share a common descent from Edward III through John of Gaunt (Henry III of Castile, Philip's great-great-great-grandfather, married Catherine, daughter of John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster).⁸⁰ Therefore, Christopherson concludes that England is Philip's home and native country, and that by this marriage the noble blood of England is thus joined together. However, even if the Queen were to marry a foreigner, Christopherson argues that this is not a strange thing for "it is the common practise of all princes of the worlds," demonstrated by several successful examples, such as the marriage of Isabella of Castile, Mary's grandmother, and Ferdinand of Aragon.⁸¹ He emphasised further that there had been several marriage bonds between England and Spain, such as the marriage of Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon. Consequently, Mary's marriage is not an innovation, but follows the convention.

Finally, both Proctor and Christopherson justify Mary's decision by affirming that the marriage is absolutely beneficial in terms of public welfare as the Queen

⁷⁹ Proctor, *The History*, 220.

⁸⁰ Christopherson, *An Exhortation*, sig. M5v.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, sig. N5-7.

herself had declared. Christopherson enthusiastically praises the kingly nature of Philip as well as the greatness of Spain. He indicates that the Prince is not only “sage and sober,” but also of a very gentle behaviour. By Philip’s gentleness, all his subjects love him and are in great sorrow about his departure for this marriage, “by reasion y^t he hathe at all times in all poyntes so gently behaued him selfe toward them, a[nd] therfore thei had rather haue dyed, then y^t he shuld haue departed from them”⁸² On account of his gentleness, Christopherson is strongly of the opinion that Philip would never harm English people or interests. On the contrary, he believes that Philip’s connections would enhance English friendship with Spain, Flanders and Germany, bringing more trade (economic benefit) and stronger defence (political and diplomatic interests) against “our aunciente enemies”—France.⁸³

Proctor also highlights the righteousness of the Spanish alliance in the final part of his work by quoting Wyatt at his arraignment. According to what Proctor himself heard, Wyatt confessed that he had erroneously supposed that, by the marriage of the Prince of Spain, this realm would be “brought to bondage and servitude by aliens and Strangers. Which brutish beastliness then seemed reason; and wrought so far and to such effect as it led me to the practice and use of this committed treason.” But now he realised “the great commodity honour and surety which this realm shall receive by this marriage.”⁸⁴ Proctor concludes Wyatt’s statement with feeling, saying “all others blindly fallen into the same error, would by the examples of Wyatt rise also to

⁸² Ibid., sig. N1v.

⁸³ Ibid., sig. N2-3.

⁸⁴ Proctor, *The History*, 254.

repentance; as well confessing to the World with open voice their detestable mischief, . . . as in utterance of the former words" confessed by Wyatt.⁸⁵

Both of these two apologists echo Mary's arguments about her own marriage to an impressive degree. Besides the discussion of the motivations behind Wyatt's rebellion, Christopherson manifestly supports Mary's freedom to choose her husband. He suggests that a marriage can never be lawful unless it is freely made by "the full consent of both parties." Even though parents hold crucial authority to choose spouses for their children, they must not compel their children, contrary to their affection, to accept any one they would like to appoint. How much less, therefore, should the Queen be ruled by others who are commanded by God to obey her? Christopherson insists resolutely that the Queen has the right and liberty to decide her marriage and all her subjects are commanded by God to submit to her decision without any defiance.⁸⁶ Following Mary's argument, Christopherson suggests that the Queen accepted the matrimony only for the quietness and comfort of the whole realm and that her decision was inspired and approved by God:

her care was only to marry with such one, as myght throughe his singuler vertue please god, through his greate wisdom helpe well to gouerne this realme, and for his noble lynage be occasion of mucche honour and quietnesse to our countrie Therefore while her grace made this godly a[nd] humble petition to almighty god, came there into her remembraunce this noble prince of Spayne.⁸⁷

⁸⁵ Ibid., 254-55.

⁸⁶ Christopherson, *An Exhortation*, sig. L3-4.

⁸⁷ Ibid., sig. L6r.

He emphasises that the first motion of this marriage came from God, without the counsel or advice of man, and hence the marriage pleases God.

As for John Proctor, his tract reaffirms Mary's self-representation as a wife of the realm. He exhibits Mary's speech in Guildhall and emphasises the part which related to her marriage:

. . . her Highness affirmed that nothing was done herein by herself alone, but with consent and advisement of the whole Council, upon deliberate consultation, that this conduction and Second Marriage should greatly advance this realm (whereunto she was first married) to much honour, quiet, and gain.

. . . Such matter passed from her besides as did so wonderfully enamour the hearts of the hearers as it was a world to hear with what shouts they exalted the honour and magnanimity of Queen Mary.⁸⁸

It is the compatibility between Mary's "first" and "second marriage" which Proctor accentuates. He also relates Mary's wifely obeisance to the advancement of public wealth and tranquillity, thus resolving the queen's private and public responsibility at the same time, without disregarding traditional constructions of women's role and the duty of a sovereign.

IV. The demonstration of English patriotism

The works of John Proctor and John Christopherson as government propaganda might have reinforced people's conformity to the Queen's choice to some degree.

⁸⁸ Proctor, *The History*, 239. Proctor records the date of Mary's oration as on 31 January 1554, which is different from Foxe's on 1 February 1554.

However, suspicion of foreign infiltration was not wiped away immediately. Instead, after Mary's marriage with Philip II was concluded in July 1554. Philip's ceaseless endeavour to crown himself exacerbated many Englishmen's aversion to the Spanish match, especially among English Protestants. It was even more unpleasant to Protestants that the new coinage of September 1554 depicted two monarchs with a crown over their heads and the inscription "Philip, et Maria Dei Gratia Rex et Regina Anglie Francie et Neapolis Princeps Hispanic."⁸⁹ The new coinage, symbolising Philip sharing royal authority, offended Protestants so much that they had to bring the emotive issue of the foreign match to a national level, fomenting patriotic hatred of the Spanish Prince.

English Protestants consequently wrote several pamphlets to protest Spanish influence. Three of them expose the danger of Spanish domination most strikingly: *A Supplicacyon to the Queenes Majestie* (1555), *A Warnyng for Englande Conteynyng the Horrible Practises of the Kyng of Spayn in the Kyngedom of Naples. . .* (1555), and John Bradford's, *The Copy of a Letter* (1556).⁹⁰ The authors of *A Supplicacyon* and *A Warnyng for Englande* are unknown, but they are certainly Protestant works. As for John Bradford, his standing is a little controversial. This John Bradford (not to be confused with the Protestant martyr of the same name)

⁸⁹ R. Ruding, *Annals of the Coinage of Great Britain and its Dependencies: from the Earliest Period of Authentic History to the Reign of Victoria* (London: J. Hearne, 1840), I, 133. In the beginning of Mary's reign the currency bore the new queen's image alone, but in early September 1554, the new coins bearing two faces began to appear. *Queen Jane and Queen Mary*, 82.

⁹⁰ *A Supplicacyon to the Queenes Majestie* (Strassburg: W. Rihel, 1555, STC 17562).; *A Warnyng for Englande. . .* (Strassburg: heirs of W. Köpbel? 1555? STC 10023.7); John Bradford's *The Copy of a Letter, sent by John Bradforth to the Erles of Arundel, Darbie, Shrewsburye and Pembroke* (London: Wesel? Lambrecht? 1556? STC 3504.5) was reprinted in John Strype, *Ecclesiastical memorials*, III, ii, 339-54.

states that he was once a servant to Sir William Skipworth and that he had lived as a servant of the King of Spain's privy councillors for two or three years, and hence, could converse with them and saw and heard their words and letters against England in person.⁹¹ Bradford therefore insists that the Protestant criticism of Spanish nature, unlike his own, is not founded on truth but on hearsay. He also alleges that English Protestants attempted to plant their religion under the cloak of fervent love of the country. His bitter criticism of Protestants makes D. M. Loades believe that the *Letter* is a Catholic tract and not a Protestant one.⁹² Nevertheless, on the whole, Bradford's point of view and conclusion are still rather pro Protestant.⁹³

All these three pamphleteers are written in a manner that appeals to the Queen and English people, in order to object to Mary's Spanish alliance, especially to the coronation of Philip as King of England. It is significant that they manipulate anti-Spanish sentiment to engender a different comprehension of the Queen's status and her marriage from the government. The pamphleteers' notion of Spanish oppression

⁹¹ Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, III, i, 418.

⁹² D. M. Loades, "The Authorship and Publication of *The Cope of a letter sent by John Bradforth to the Right honorable Lordes The Erles of Arundel, Darbie, Shrewsbury and Penbroke* (STC 3480)," *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 3 (1960): 155-60.

⁹³ Several scholars view Bradford's tract as a Protestant work. C. H. Garret assumes that Bradford's criticism of Protestantism is a conscious disguise adopted by the Protestant author to give his work greater currency. See C. H. Garrett, *The Marian Exiles: A Study in the Origins of Elizabethan Puritanism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938), 96-97. In addition, Malcolm R. Thorp and William S. Maltby also agree with her opinion and see this work as a very Protestant one. Maltby points out that "Bradford naively denied that he was a Protestant and pretended to concentrate on the low moral standards of Philip's retinue, but the bulk of his tract is taken up with doctrinal arguments against the sacraments, the liturgy, and the priesthood—a clumsy attempt to turn popular distrust of strangers to the purpose of religious reform." See Maltby, *The Black Legend*, 29. Although Loades indicates the difference between the copy in Foxii MSS and the B. M. text (C.8; b.8) and that John Strype's version in his *Ecclesiastical Memorials* was the same as the version in Foxii MSS, he assures that Strype's version is exactly a Protestant edition, which still can help us to explore the Protestant viewpoint.

indeed has great value for our understanding of the development of English national sentiment. Their arguments are constructed in three ways. First is about Philip's personal defects, his sexual irregularity in particular. For instance, John Bradford attacks the low moral standards of King Philip and his countrymen, which he purposely says that he feels it so shameful to report the full loathsome lechery of this Spanish King, but allows himself to make the following moderate commentary:

Paradventure her Grace thinketh the Kinge wyll kepe her the mor companye, and love her the better, yf she gyve him the crowne; ye wyll crown him to make him lyve chaste, contrarye to the nature: for paradventure, after he wer crowned, he woulde be content with one woman, but in the mean space he muste have three or four in one nyght, to prove which of them he lyketh best, not of ladyes and jentyllwomen, but of bakers doughthers, and suche poore whores.⁹⁴

Second, these writers demonstrate Spaniards' cruelty and perfidiousness by the examples of the Spanish rule in Naples and other Spanish domains. Bradford cites two books, *The Lamentation of Napelles* and *The Mourning of Mylayne*, which he asks people to read thoroughly in order to know the Spaniards' brutality. He indicates that in Naples and Milan the inhabitants pay excessive taxes on fires, chimneys and on all sorts of food. He therefore asks English people to pay heed to the two cities' history in order to avoid the same suffering.⁹⁵

Likewise, both *A Supplicacyon* and *A Warnyng* recount the history of Naples' bondage and slavery under Spanish rule. The author of *A Warnyng*, alluding to the marriage between Mary and a Spanish prince, points out that the Kingdom of Naples

⁹⁴ Bradford, *The Cope of a Letter*, 352.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 351.

“cam in to the hands of the Spanyards by a pretendid titell of mariage.”⁹⁶ As their usual device to override another nation, the Spanish began their oppression by sweet promises and friendly offers, swearing to respect the old freedom and liberty of Naples “with an unfayned love in outward appearance to ther state and common welth.”⁹⁷ Under the cloak of amity and friendship, the author indicates, the Spanish would gradually set up their own ministers and fortresses as they “discharged al the inborn subjescts of the realme as wel gentelmen as other from bearing any kynde of rule through out the whole kyngdom, geuing the whole trust and charge thereof to the only Spanyards.”⁹⁸ The author of *A Supplicacyon* also describes this process and indicates that those Spaniards raised all kinds of “unreasonable excyses and tolls both of corn, wyne, salte, and frutes etc., so that the nobles and comons of Naples be brought in to very beggery and slauerye.” The same extreme taxes were levied in Milan as well as a chimney tax, “that euery man, rych and poure must pay for euery chymny, that they haue in ther houses, a french crown of gold.”⁹⁹ Both writers go on to point out that the same heavy taxes were imposed in other Spanish dominions, such as in Holland, Brabant, Zeeland, and Flanders; the inhabitants must pay taxes on all that they wear, drink, and eat. They suggest strikingly that this process will be repeated in England: as the amiable terms end in Spanish domination, one misery will follow another.

⁹⁶ *A Warnyng*, sig. A3r.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, sig. A4r. This process is also recounted in *A Supplicacyon*, sig. C4v-5r.

⁹⁹ *A Supplicacyon*, sig. C5r. The same see *A Warnyng*, sig. A4v, A6v.

All the Protestant writers conclude that Spaniards are an untrustworthy people who deceive by cajolery. They sugar their pretences with pleasing flattery and compliment, promising rewards and gifts: "they beare faier face toward you and pretend you great frendshipe." John Bradford asserts that

[The Spanish] myschievous maners a man shall never knowwe, untyll he come under ther subjection: but then shall he perfectlye perceyve and fele them: which thinge I praye God England never do: for in dissimulations untyll they have their purposes, and afterwards in oppression and tyrannye, when they can obtayne them, they do exceed all other nations upon the earth.¹⁰⁰

The writers, hence, warn their readers to pay heed to Spanish tricks, especially "when the Spaniards shall tempt now with ther promissis, stop not one eare alone but both." And the warning of warnings is that "one unaduisid grant may gyne your enemies a knif to cut your ounne throates and disherit your childer for euer and bring England vnwares to a most shameful and perpetuall captiuitie."¹⁰¹

The third way by which these writers put forward anti-Spanish theme is to introduce the term "bondage," or an awareness of the loss of English freedom into their discourse. The writers claim the possibility that England will be brought into the same bondage and slavery "like as the emproure hath done Naples, Myland and hys nether contres of Flanders, Holland, Seland, Brabant, Fryseland and Lygzelburg etc. . . ."¹⁰² They warn the nobles that the bringing in of proud Spaniards will bring in the destruction of their honours, possessions, offices and lands. In addition, they

¹⁰⁰ Bradford, *The Cope of a Letter*, 342.

¹⁰¹ *A Warnyng*, sig. A2r.

¹⁰² *A Supplicacyon*, sig. C5r.

will be cast away "either by condempning them for heresy, by piking one quarell or another to them, or to send them in to strang contres to excersys them in feates of warres." In the respect of religion, similarly, England may come into the servitude and tyranny of the Bishop of Rome.¹⁰³

Moreover, the writers are convinced that Spaniards, wicked and treacherous by their nature, must never stop by the same tricks of agreeable promises and fine gifts to cause Philip to be crowned, and "make hym king, not in name only, but in deed."¹⁰⁴ Then the Prince will definitely "have this noble realme of Enland to hym and to hys heirs and so contrary to the Statutis made in the other perlyaments, disinheryte all the reight full heyres of the Realme."¹⁰⁵ The lamentable result, for those Protestant writers, is that

neuer a noble man in England wold serue for the quenes Maiestie, but that England be fayne to bestowe all ther treasure and ryches to bring in a stranger to raine ouer them, who with the bisshoppes aduise and helpe will bring this noble realme in to be beggery and vyle slauerie. . . .¹⁰⁶

That would be "a plage above all plages," the author of *A Supplicacyon* deplores. The writers maintain explicitly that Philip married the Queen not out of sincere and pure motives, but aimed to take English treasure out of the realm in order to maintain his war with France and to pay his debt to his father.¹⁰⁷ The marriage seems to them to be a plot designed by both father and son, for otherwise they would choose a

¹⁰³ Ibid., sig. C5v, D1v.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., sig. C2r.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., sig. C5r.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., sig. C6v.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., sig. D1r.

younger bride who could bear a child.¹⁰⁸ According to John Bradford, the Spaniards had stated that “yf they obtayne not the crowne, they maye curse the tyme that ever the Kinge was maryed to a wyfe so unmeet for him by natural course of years.”¹⁰⁹ Therefore, only the dynastic attempt to obtain the crown can explain Spanish behaviour.

These three writers' views of Spanish evils are echoed by other Protestant writers, such as John Knox, John Ponet, and some other pamphleteers.¹¹⁰ They all believe that the marriage between Mary and Philip had opened the way for an influx of unprincipled Spaniards, who were particularly oppressive and ambitious to overrule other nations, as they had demonstrated by force and deviousness elsewhere. The fact that almost all the anti-Spanish pamphlets were written by Protestants in the reign of Mary, clearly demonstrates that those Protestant attacks on Spanish rule were primarily motivated by their religious opposition to Philip's Catholicism. None the less, their manipulation of xenophobic emotion and the fear of Spanish domination overtly exhibits an awareness of English patriotism. More significantly, they bring out an impressive consciousness of English freedom. They claim unhesitatingly the old liberty of England: “our noble Realme and Fre country,” which has always been the most free country in the Christendom; “now without gods great mercye and help

¹⁰⁸ *A Warnyng*, sig. A6v.

¹⁰⁹ Bradford, *The Cope of a Letter*, 348.

¹¹⁰ John Knox expresses the same view toward the Spaniards in his *A Faythful Admonition vuto the Professours of Gods truth in England* (1554, STC 15059) in *The Works of John Knox*, III, ed. David Laing (Edinburgh: James Thin, 1845, reprint, New York: AMS Press, 1966); John Ponet, *A Short Treatise of Politike Power, and of the true obedience which subjectes owe to kynges and other civile governours* (1556, STC 20178); reprinted in Winthrop S. Hudson, *John Ponet (1516?-1556), Advocate of Limited Monarchy* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1942).

is lyke to be brought in to the most miserable, vyle servitude and bondage by a straunge people whom all christends hath hatith and abhoryth.”¹¹¹

In short, English Protestants not only exploit the issue of foreign infiltration to oppose the Queen's marriage, but also connect it with the idea of a free country. Their idea of English freedom offers a valuable opportunity to reconsider Quentin Skinner's thesis of the “neo-roman understanding of civil liberty” that was dominant in mid-seventeenth century Anglophone political theory.¹¹² Skinner tells a fascinating story of how the Roman idea of civil liberty was transmitted to Italian Renaissance thinkers, the most important of whom was Machiavelli, and was then further passed down to the writers in the English Revolution. This Roman or “neo-roman” idea of liberty, according to him, rests personal liberty on the freedom of the state, so that citizens have to defend the independence of their country in order to safeguard their own freedom. Based on Patrick Collinson's research, Skinner is able to claim that some variants of the “neo-roman theory of civil liberty” landed in England as early as the late Elizabethan period, although he does not indicate how close they were to the mid-seventeenth century Anglophone “neo-roman” paradigm.¹¹³

The foregoing analysis of Marian Protestant dissenters would amend Skinner's thesis in two important respects. First, Marian Protestants' idea of free state predated the “earliest” appearance in England that either Skinner or Collinson has noted.

¹¹¹ *A Supplicacyon*, sig. C5r, C7v.

¹¹² Quentin Skinner, *Liberty Before Liberalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), ix.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, xiv, 11-12.

Protestant writers view the essence of English freedom as being its independence from foreign interference, and they believe that as soon as a ruling queen marries a foreign prince, the country will be brought into servitude. This brings us the second amendment, namely that Marian Protestant writers show little trace of Roman or Italian Renaissance influence. Their anxiety was occasioned by a practical danger that their Queen was resolved to marry a foreign prince. They reproduce the traditional construction of matrimony, declaring that the husband's authority will replace the Queen's will, and her property will become his. The assumption that the nation was liable to be altered and commanded by an alien supremacy after the Queen married is self-evident to most people. Hypothetically, if England were ruled by a king in the mid-sixteenth century, all these worries about servitude and pretence of national freedom might not have taken place. Therefore, the idea of free state in Anglophone thought arose from the historical contingency that England was ruled by a queen and she was educated to marry and obey her husband. It is the patriarchal construction of gender roles, not Roman political theory and Renaissance civic humanism, that underlies the idea of free state in Mary's reign.

Furthermore, the writers usher in a question: "whether the crowne belonge to the Quene or the realme," as John Bradford asks. If the crown belongs to the Queen, she can legally alter the installed succession, "contrary to the discretion of the whole realme and natyon of Engleshemmen," so the rightful heir is in danger, or even the realm itself, which might be delivered into the hands of foreigners at the Queen's

will. John Bradford, in order to prevent Mary from depriving Elizabeth of succession, argues that,

Yf the crowne wer the Quene's, in suche sorte as she myghte do with it what she woulde, bothe nowe and after her death, there myght appear some rightfull pretence in geving yt over to a straunger prince: but seing yt belongeth to the heirs of Ingland after her death, ye comytt deadly synne and dampnation, un unjustlye gevyng and taking awaye of the rughte of others.¹¹⁴

He suggests that it is a sin or a rebellion for a ruling queen to change the right order of succession which has been approved by the parliament, because the crown should not belong to her but to the realm; or put it further, it belongs to the people as a whole. The inference is that the people's will should rule the country, rather than the queen's own will, which displays the prototype of popular monarchy in political thought. Ultimately, although these writers were unable to persuade the Queen to break off her Spanish alliance, their attachment of the Queen's disregard for public will to a form of treason or infidelity (with reference to the husband/wife relationship between the Queen and her country) was a powerful weapon with which to contest the Queen's and her apologists' arguments about her princely care and duty.

In conclusion, the Queen's gender and English patriotism, rather than religious discontent, were indeed the two principal ingredients in the controversy of Mary's Spanish match. They determined the general attitude of English people's aversion to the Queen's marriage with Philip, and therefore set the people's will in opposition to

¹¹⁴ Bradforth, *The Cope of a Letter*, 352.

the Queen's own will. This reality forced Mary to fashion her marriage as her princely duty to produce an heir and to advance public good and comfort. She styled herself as a loyal wife wedded to England and a Queen mindful of the people's will. Nevertheless, she ultimately still disregarded the people's will and insisted on her own will, which was manifestly influenced by the Emperor, to assert a Spanish alliance. The conflict between the Queen's will and people's will also prompted the Queen's apologists to reinforce her argument and stress the benefit of the Spanish match. Both John Christopherson and John Proctor dealt with the issue of foreign infiltration earnestly in order to eliminate the people's anxiety: Proctor sought to alleviate people's suspicion of Spanish domination by accentuating the good will of the Spaniards, drawing attention instead to the threat of France; Christopherson attempted to wipe out this whole problem by positing Philip as native Englishman.

Nevertheless, those two ingredients, the Queen's female sex and English national sentiment, were most meticulously exploited by Protestant pamphleteers in 1555. They elaborately drew attention to the cruelty of Spaniards and the danger that England would lose its noble liberty upon the Queen's marriage. More significantly, the Protestant writers expressed an awareness of England's freedom, which generated a new language, taking the issue of the queen's marriage away from a consideration of the monarch's free choice and dynastic benefits, to the issue of a free state. Protestants powerfully displayed the disadvantages of a foreign match: to marry a foreigner was to relinquish English autonomy into the hands of foreigners, as if being conquered by them; and it was to alienate the ruling queen from her own country and

people, making the queen estranged from her subjects. To a great degree, they expressed and promoted society's prejudice against foreigners and thus ushered in a general and tangible sense of nationhood in the next reign. In this regard, we can argue that the controversy about Mary's Spanish match increased the development of an English sense of nationhood.

Chapter 6

Elizabeth's French Alliance and England's Independence

I. A perpetual virgin?

For a long time, Elizabeth's attitude towards her own marriage has confused modern English historians as much as it did contemporaries. The source of this confusion lies with the Queen herself, for Elizabeth spoke as much of marriage as that she would not marry. Especially for those ambassadors or delegates from her suitors, they seemed never to be able to be sure of the queen's determination. The Spanish ambassador, Count De Feria, once wrote to his master, Philip II, that "to say the truth I could not tell your Majesty what this woman means to do with herself, and those who know her best know no more than I do."¹ King Philip was more pessimistic and suspicious of Elizabeth's intention. He said to his ambassador that "it is nothing but a trick and pastime from beginning to end," and that "she is deceiving Sussex and Leicester as well as she does others."²

William Camden, the first Elizabethan biographer, had provided a positive view of Elizabeth's determination of celibacy. According to his *Annales: the True and*

¹ Count De Feria to the King, 18 April 1559, *CSP Spain*, I, 57.

² The King to Guzman De Silva, 23 May 1568, *CSP Spain*, II, 36-37.

Royal History of the Famous Empresse Elizabeth, when some parliamentary delegation presented Elizabeth with a petition to marry in 1559, her answer showed a clear sign of her distaste to marriage and that she took a perpetual vow of virginity, committed to living and dying as a holy virgin. "Hereupon haue I chosen that kinde of life, which is most free from the troublesome cares of this world, that I might attend the service of God alone," Elizabeth is said to have declared, flouting the course of marriage as an "inconsiderate folly." Furthermore, as she concludes, "I have already ioyned my selfe in marriage to an husband, namely, the Kingdome of England, . . . if when I shall let my last breath, it be ingraven upon my Marble Tombe, Here lyeth ELIZABETH, which raigned a Virgin, and dyed a Virgin."³ Camden's account is frequently cited by modern scholars to support the widespread view that Elizabeth committed herself to celibacy from the very start of her reign. But Elizabeth herself on many occasions also expressed that "there was nothing that she desired more than to marry."⁴ In fact, Elizabeth's willingness to marry has proved as much of an enigma to modern scholars as to her contemporaries; as J. E. Neale observes, "among the legion of her remarks on the subject, some false, some true, and some betwixt and between—and which were which no one really knew."⁵

As diverse as Elizabeth's own statements and contemporaries' opinions were, there exist in modern scholarship two kinds of fallacies that tend to distort the understanding of the issue of marriage in the reign of Elizabeth. The first fallacy is

³ William Camden, *Annales, or the Historie of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princess Elizabeth Late Queen of England*, trans. R. Norton (London: B. Fisher, 1635, STC 4501), 16.

⁴ Bernardino De Mendoza to the King, 19 March 1582, *CSP Spain*, III, 318.

⁵ J. E. Neale, *Queen Elizabeth* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1938), 81.

the assumption that she took a vow of perpetual virginity, and hence she consciously, persistently and cunningly intended to avoid matrimony and encouraged the cult of a Virgin Queen. It argues that Elizabeth could by this means manipulate celibacy to convert the weakness of her sex into powerful images of self-representation, such as Virgo-Astraea and Virgin Mary.⁶ This assumption has recently been contradicted by John King's research.⁷ He contends that there was a shift from early Elizabethan eulogy as "a nubile virgin" to the late adulation as "a perpetual virgin." Instead of viewing Elizabeth's vow as a continuous and timeless phenomenon, he points out that until 1583 Elizabeth's marriagability was stressed more than her determination to remain a virgin. Furthermore, through comparison with other documents, King argues that Camden's version of Elizabeth's answer to the parliamentary delegations might be a later addition, or even rewritten by Camden himself.⁸ Susan Doran follows John King's stress on chronological sensitivity in her study of Elizabethan plays and entertainments relating to the Queen's marriage. Yet, Doran sees this shift as occurring precisely in the year of 1578 during Elizabeth's visit to Norwich

⁶ See Frances A. Yates, *Astraea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century* (London: Pimlico, 1975), 59, 76-77. Frances Yates concurs that "the virginity of the queen was used as a powerful political weapon all through her reign. Many foreign potentates hoped to win her hand. She coquetted with them, played them off against one another, and never married." 86-87.

⁷ John N. King, "Queen Elizabeth I: Representations of the Virgin Queen," *Renaissance Quarterly* 43 (1990): 30-74. His point of view is agreed by several scholars, for example, Carole Levin's *The Heart and Stomach of a King* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994), 41; and Ilona Bell's "Elizabeth I: Always Her Own Free Woman," in *Political Rhetoric, Power, and Renaissance Women*, eds. Carole Levin and Patricia A. Sullivan (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995), 57-82.

⁸ King, "Queen Elizabeth I: Representations of the Virgin Queen," 36.

and emphasises that thereafter the Queen and her subjects both began to promote an image of a Virgin Queen for her.⁹

In any case, the assumption of Elizabeth's perpetual virginity is indeed an interpretation with hindsight. In her first half reign, not only councillors and foreign ambassadors expected the Queen to marry, but Elizabeth herself had also expressed a strong desire for marriage. As Susan Doran suggests, Elizabeth and her contemporaries took all her marriage negotiations seriously, especially on two occasions: one with the Lord Robert Dudley in 1560 and another with Francis Duke of Alençon in 1579.¹⁰ In short, there is no evidence confirming that the Queen took a perpetual vow of virginity, although it was very obvious that she played with the idea that she would accept a husband eventually, either for her personal fulfilment or political interests.

The second fallacy is the assumption that Elizabeth was always "a free woman," and able to manipulate the course of her marriage negotiations through deliberate dissimulation and inventive statements, thus preserving her autonomy in a patriarchal world.¹¹ Some recent scholars, whose research focuses on Elizabeth's own speeches and arguments, are convinced that her rhetoric is entirely novel and unprecedented, differentiating Elizabeth from her sister, Mary. Some even indicate

⁹ Susan Doran, "Juno versus Diana: the Treatment of Elizabeth I's Marriage in Plays and Entertainments, 1561-1581," *The Historical Journal*, 38-2 (1995): 257-74.

¹⁰ Susan Doran, *Monarchy and Matrimony: The Courtships of Elizabeth I* (London: Routledge, 1996), 1, 11.

¹¹ For example, Louis Montrose claims that Elizabeth could defended "her maidenly freedom and royal prerogative against. . . patriarchal expectation." See his "The Elizabethan Subject and the Spenserian Text," in *Literary Theory / Renaissance Texts*, eds. Patricia Parker and David Quint (Baltimore: the Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986), 314-15.

that her meddling with the issue of marriage manifests a primitive form of feminism.¹² Elizabeth, therefore, seems to outwit her contemporaries and keep consciously formulating her discourse. Moreover, it is claimed, she could completely dominate the choice of marriage or celibacy. Consequently, most scholars usually tend to overlook the similarities between Mary and Elizabeth and emphasise the contrasts between the sisters.

This presumption also tends to confirm Elizabeth's remarkable self-assurance and self-confidence. Nevertheless, Susan Frye, in her study of Elizabethan representation, has pointed out the error in presuming that Elizabeth's power or her iconography were absolutely unquestionable. She argues that "Elizabeth must have been less grand, less totalitarian than the heroic image with which so many of us are familiar."¹³ Rather than advocating a monolithic and absolute form of Elizabeth's authority, Frye suggests instead that the course of Elizabeth's representation was more dynamic and competitive than is usually assumed. By the same token, we should not suppose that Elizabeth wielded a complete dominance, able to move with resolution and clairvoyance, in the issue of her marriage. Furthermore, we should reassess the presumption that there was a great contradiction between Mary and Elizabeth. It is vital to bear in mind that Elizabeth lived in the same Renaissance

¹² For example, Susan Bassnett views Elizabeth as a role-model, "a symbol of active female assertiveness for future generations," in her *Elizabeth I: A Feminist Perspective* (Oxford: St. Martin's Press, 1988), 128. Similarly Ilona Bell suggests that "Elizabeth's politics of courtship should be defined as a form, howsoever primitive or inadvertent, of feminism," in her "Elizabeth I: Always Her Own Free Woman," 58.

¹³ Susan Frye, *Elizabeth I: The Competition for Representation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 11.

constructions of the female sex as her half-sister. Actually, the two ingredients in the discourse of Queen Mary's marriage—the queen's gender and English xenophobia prejudices—still worked in the discourse of Elizabeth's marriage. However, it was not until 1579 when the Queen showed fervent commitment to her suitor—Francis, Duke of Alençon—that these two ingredients rose up to demonstrate themselves strikingly.

Accordingly, this chapter will be aware of the two fallacies mentioned above and is firstly going to study the formulation of Elizabeth's arguments concerning her marriage, between 1558 and 1584, in order to compare them with those of Queen Mary. The discussion will be grounded in her own speeches, letters and the reports from ambassadors who negotiated marriage with Elizabeth and her ministers. Secondly, in all of Elizabeth's marriage negotiations, Alençon's courtship, from 1572 to 1584, was the final opportunity for Elizabeth to get married and she herself also showed the most genuine inclination towards marriage. During that time, however, the people's opposition to the Queen's marriage (the contradiction between the Queen's will and people's will) reached its peak. This chapter, therefore, will not detail the progress of each one of Elizabeth's courtships, but will focus on the dissension and confrontation between the Queen and her opponents during Alençon's courtship. In addition, the objection to the Queen's French match here will be primarily represented by two Protestant writers, John Stubbs and Philip Sidney. Their works, written in the manner of "mirror-for-queens," deployed a similar argument to that of Marian Protestants in treating the issue of the Queen's marriage

as not only a religious threat, but a national danger too. Consequently, this chapter, like the previous one, investigates the connection of the controversy of the Queen's marriage with her gender and the sense of nationhood in England.

II. The words of a prince

Elizabeth declared her attitude to marriage for the first time in her address to the parliamentary delegations in replying to the petition of marriage on 10 February 1559. This speech has two versions, one recorded by William Camden, the other contained in a British Library Lansdowne Manuscript. Camden's version is, however, not recommended by either J. E. Neale or John King. King points out that Camden's transcription is a falsification.¹⁴ Similarly, J. E. Neale does not use Camden's account in his biography of Elizabeth I, with the justification that "I know of no text from which he could have made it, and it does not correspond with the Queen's description. I have therefore ignored it."¹⁵ The more plausible version in the Lansdowne Manuscript differs in many respects from Camden's, and does not contain references to a symbolic matrimony for the Queen, wedded to her realm. "In all likelihood," concludes John King "this very clean copy was transcribed at the

¹⁴ King, "Queen Elizabeth I: Representations of the Virgin Queen," 35-36. King argues that Camden's version "is less accurate as a portrayal of the Tudor queen than it is of Jacobean patronage and politics," and that his version "came to enshrine a posthumous myth of Elizabeth as a perpetual virgin," which provides a Jacobean representation rather than a Tudor's.

¹⁵ J. E. Neale, *Elizabeth I and Her Parliaments 1559-1581* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1954), 47, n. 3.

behest of Cecil or someone close to the man who served as chief secretary of state throughout most of the queen's reign."¹⁶

However, although we cannot trust Camden's version without further investigation, it should not be completely disregarded as King suggests. In the reign of Elizabeth, the Queen's speeches were usually recorded by various persons who either heard in person or overheard from others, and therefore there may be diverse versions for each speech; even the printed versions might be to some degree different from the Queen's real statements. Elizabeth's famous "Golden Speech" of 1601 and her oration in Tilbury Camp in 1588, for example, both have variant versions recording the same speech on the same day, including the printed one.¹⁷ So there is a possibility that Camden transcribed his record from an unofficial but confidential source which was modified when put into print, and therefore his version might still contain some accuracy.

Camden's version can be further affirmed if we compare it with Queen Mary's speech concerning her marriage.¹⁸ There is a surprising similarity between Mary's oration in the Guild Hall in 1554 and Elizabeth's speech recorded by Camden:

I have already ioyned my selfe in marriage to an husband, namely, the Kingdome of England. And behold (said she, which I marvaile ye have forgotten,) the pledge of this my wedlocke and marriage with my kingdom, (and therewith, she stretched forth her finger and shewed the ring of gold

¹⁶ King, "Queen Elizabeth I: Representations of the Virgin Queen," 36. This version is in British Library Lansdown MSS. 94, f. 29. It is also printed in *Parliaments*, I, 44-45. J. E. Neale indicates that "the speech appears to have been printed, though I know of no such copy surviving," in his *Elizabeth I and Her Parliaments*, 50, n. 1.

¹⁷ For the different versions of Golden Speech, see Chapter 4, section II. For the versions of Elizabeth's speech in Tilbury Camp see Susan Frye, "The Myth of Elizabeth at Tilbury," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 23-1 (1992): 95-114.

¹⁸ See Foxe, VI, 414-15 and previous chapter.

wherwith at her coronation she had in a set forme of words, solemnly given her selfe in marriage to her kingdome). Here having made a pawse, and doe not (saith she) upbraid me with miserable lacke of children: for every one of you, and as many as are English, are children, and kinsmen to me.¹⁹

In this speech, Elizabeth utilises a similar expression to Mary, pointing out her marriages to the realm. It was noteworthy that Mary in her oration did not mean to prohibit herself from marriage by saying that she was already wedded to the country, like a nun bridled to God, but gained the advantage of representing herself as a loyal wife and a loving mother to her subjects. By the same reasoning, Elizabeth did not essentially declare that she chose celibacy.

This sort of statement was obviously a "rhetorical strategy," which Elizabeth appeared to learn from Mary. It should not be treated as a declamation of perpetual virginity, nor had it been used only by a virgin. James I, for example, made a similar speech to his parliament in 1604 when he was already a husband and father: "I am the husband, and all the whole Isle is my lawfull Wife."²⁰ Actually, Elizabeth repeated to make use of this analogy as Chapter 2 has shown, displaying her particular commitment to the country which was of value in representational propaganda. That is to say, it is very likely that Camden's version contains authentic sources, which does not necessarily imply Elizabeth's perpetual vow of celibacy.

¹⁹ Camden, *Annales*, 16.

²⁰ Cited in Levin, *The Heart and Stomach of a King*, 41.

Regarding Elizabeth's official first speech in parliament preserved in the Lansdowne Manuscript, it is apparent that she first of all displays her admirable and pure idea of chastity as firmly as people would expect from a virtuous woman:

I may saye unto yow that from my yeares of understanding syth I first had consideracion of my self to be borne a servitor of almightie God I happelie chose this kynde of life in which I yet lyve, which I assure yow for myne owne parte hath hitherto best contented my self and I truste hath bene moost acceptable to God. . . . But so constant have I allwayes contynued in this determynacion, although my youth and woords may seme to some hardlie to agree together, yet is it mooste true that at this daie I stand free from anie other meaninge that either I have had in tymes paste or have at this present.²¹

Her preference for the unmarried life is thus as vigorously articulated as Mary's had been. Nevertheless, as a fulfilment of the princely duty, she hints that God might convert her heart into another lifestyle—taking a husband—should it be necessary for the sake of country's welfare:

Nevertheles, if any of yow be in suspect, that whensoever it may please God to enclyne my harte to an other kynd of life, ye may well assure your selves my meaninge is not to do/ or determyne anie thinge wherwith the realme may or shall have iuste cause to be discontented. . . . I will never in that matter conclud any thing that shalbe preiudiciall to the realme, ffor the weale, good and safetie wherof I will never shune to spend my life. And whomsoever my chaunce shalbe to light apon I truste he shalbe as carefull for the realme and yow— I will not saie as my self because I can not so certenlie determyne of any other, but at the least wayes, by my good will and desire he shalbe such as shalbe as carefull for the preservacion of the realme and yow as my self.²²

She declares that she would not “shune to spench my life,” for the public good. But she also cleverly exhibits her awareness of people's anxiety, and promises that great

²¹ Lansdowne MSS 94, f. 29r. Also see *Parliaments*, I, 44-45.

²² *Ibid.*, f. 29r-v.

cautiousness unto the safety and wealth of the country would be paid to the choice of her husband, so that she would not damage English interests as Mary's marriage.

Accordingly, she argues that having an heir was the first and foremost reason for her to choose a married life, if she had to.

And albeit it might please almightie God to contynue me still in this mynde to lyve out of the state of mariage, yet it is not to be feared but he will so worke in my harte, And in your wisdomes as good provision by his healpe may be made in convenient tyme, wherby the realme shall not remayne destitute of an heir that may be fitt governor, and peradventure more beneficiall to the realme then suche ofspring as may come of me.²³

Yet, if she can not produce such a suitable successor, she concludes that she would rather keep her single life,

For although I be never so carefull of your well doinges and mynd ever so to be, yet may my issue growe out of kynde and become perhappes ungracious. And in the end, this shalbe for me sufficient, that a marble stone shall de[clare that a Queene, having raigned such a tyme, lived and] dyed a virgin.²⁴

Elizabeth's speech certainly conveys the image of herself as both a good woman and ruler.

We do not find in this speech any message of the perpetual vow of celibacy. Instead, she fashions herself as an eligible young woman for marriage. Her speech acknowledges the desirability of marriage rather than demurral, and manifests an expression of her virtue of chastity and womanly acquiescence to her country's will. Elizabeth herself rebuked the report of her vow of celibacy at the close of first

²³ Ibid., f. 29v.

²⁴ Ibid.

session in her second Parliament in April 1563. She declared that "if any here dowte that I am as it wer by vowe or determination bent never to trade that life, put oute that heresie, your belefe is awry: for as I thinke it best for a privat woman. so do I strive with my selfe to thinke it not mete for a prince; and if I can bend my wyl to your nide I wyl not resist [it] suche a mynde."²⁵ Again in the second session in November 1566:

I dyd send theym aunswere by my counseyle I wolde marrye (althowghe of myne own dysposycion I was not enclyned thereunto) I wold never speke theyme ageyne. I wyll never breke the worde of a prynce spoken in publyke place, for my honour sake. And therefore I saye ageyn, I wyll marrye assone as I can convenyentlye, yf God take not hym awaye with whom I mynde to marrye, or my self, or els sum othere great lette happen. I can saye no more exep the partie were presente. And I hope to have chylderne, otherwyse I wolde never marrie.²⁶

By the pledge of the "prince's worde," Elizabeth confirmed that, for the sake of having a child, she would get married as soon as possible. Once more, in the fourth Parliament in March 1576, the Lord Keeper spoke on behalf of the Queen:

All which matters considered, her Majesty hath called mee to say that albeit of her owne natureall disposicion shee is not disposed or inclined to marriage, neither would shee ever marrie if shee weare a private person, yet for your sakes and for the benefitt of the realme shee is contented to encline and dispose herselfe to the satisfaccion of your humble petition so that all thinges convenient may concurr that bee meete for such a marriage²⁷

This statement gave the reassurance that Elizabeth would be willing to overlook her private inclination to get married for the public benefit.

²⁵ *Parliaments*, I, 114.

²⁶ *Parliaments*, I, 147.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 464.

On the whole, there is no evidence that Elizabeth ever did make a definite commitment to remain single. Instead, Elizabeth's expression of her attitude to the marriage appeared very similar to that of Mary: she preferred a life of celibacy but recognised that marriage would be necessary as her princely duty. Both Queens articulated the dichotomy of private/public persons, differentiating between their private role and public duty, between the body natural and the body politic. As a preface to their statements, they displayed their chaste reluctance as private women. Following their representation of maidenhood, they declared that consideration of public welfare should override their personal inclinations. Therefore, they professed the desire to accept marriage for the sake of having heirs and of the country's tranquillity, as if to make an unselfish sacrifice and commitment to the country. Indeed, Queen Mary and Queen Elizabeth framed their statements in a similar mechanism and logic, to the extent that we can argue that Elizabeth was imitating Mary's rhetoric; Elizabeth's speeches were actually not so inventive as people have usually presumed.

However, although Elizabeth had demonstrated this willingness to get married for the public good, obstacles were always being placed in the way of the marriage negotiations, some by the candidates, and some by the Queen herself and her councillors. From the beginning of Elizabeth's reign to the 1560s, the three most important suitors were Robert Dudley, the Master of Horse and from 1564 the Earl of Leicester, Philip II, King of Spain, and the Archduke Charles of Austria, son of the

Emperor, Ferdinand I.²⁸ Dudley, the Queen's favourite, had only the support of some lesser figures at court, but was opposed strongly by those important councillors, including Secretary Cecil, Lord Keeper Bacon and the Earl of Arundel. The Queen therefore was dissuaded from this marriage by her important councillors' jealousy and hostility towards Dudley and "made her mind to wed some great Prince, or at all events no subject of her own."²⁹ The proposal of Philip II, the widower of the late Queen, seemed never to be treated seriously because he obviously was not popular in England. Elizabeth most likely made use of it only as a diplomatic weapon because she needed the strong position afforded by this courtship to bargain with France.³⁰ But the courtship of Archduke Charles, starting from 1563, was however taken more seriously. J. E. Neale indicates that "whenever the Imperial ambassador's hopes ran low, she set herself to revive them."³¹

There were two primary obstacles to marriage with Charles. The first was Charles's Catholicism. The imperial ambassadors wished the Archduke and his household could hold his own religion and hear the Mass. But the Queen and most of her councillors thought it offered great difficulties since "if the Queen was to attend one service and the Archduke another, . . . many dissensions and scandals would arise between the subjectes."³² The second was Elizabeth's personal request

²⁸ For the royal marriage in the 1560s, see Norman Jones, *The Birth of the Elizabethan Age: England in the 1560s* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1993), 119-55.

²⁹ Guzman De Silva to the King, 8 July 1565, *CSP Spain*, I, 454.

³⁰ See Christopher Haigh, *Elizabeth I* (London: Longman, 1988), 11; Neale, *Queen Elizabeth*, 76-77; King, "Queen Elizabeth I: Representations of the Virgin Queen," 39.

³¹ Neale, *Queen Elizabeth*, 83.

³² Guzman De Silva to the King, 23 July 1565, *CSP Spain*, I, 453. More see Susan Doran, "Religion and Politics at the Court of Elizabeth I: the Hasburg Marriage Negotiations, 1559-1567," *English Historical Review* 104 (1989): 908-26.

that she had to see the suitor before any decision was made and she would not “trust portrait painters and a thousand other things of the usual sorts.”³³ Adding further to these two obstacles were the rumours and suspicion of the relationship between Elizabeth and her Master of Horse, Robert Dudley. As early as in April 1559, there had been some reports about the scandal of their intimacy. It is said that “her Majesty visits him in his chamber day and night,” according to Count De Feria’s report, “people talk of this so freely that they go so far as to say that his wife has a malady in one of her breasts and the Queen is only waiting for her to die to marry Lord Robert.”³⁴

However, what bothered the foreign ambassadors most was the manner of Elizabeth’s conversation with them. Her words and actions were full of complexity and inconsistency. Sometimes she spoke assuredly of her marriage, at other times she declared her preference for the single life with equal vehemence. The Spanish and imperial ambassadors felt so continually confused by Elizabeth’s language that they were unable to analyse her mind. The Spanish ambassador De Feria disdained her fickleness, stating that “for my part she will never make up her mind to anything that is good for her. Sometimes she appears to want to marry him, and speaks like a

³³ The Bishop of Aquila to Count De Feria, 29 May 1559, *CSP Spain*, I, 70. Similarly, the Bishop reported to the Emperor on 2 October 1559 that the Queen said, “if she married at all it would only be to a man whom she knew.” *CSP Spain*, I, 99. Elizabeth seemed insisting seriously on this principle, perhaps because of her father’s and sister’s marriages. It was said that Henry VIII led up to his marriage with Anne of Cleves by viewing flattering portraits and later he felt extremely disappointed. As Mary’s marriage, it was said that when Philip first beheld Queen Mary, he cursed angrily the painters and envoys. Elizabeth did not want to regret as Henry for marrying a person whose looks would not satisfy her, nor did she want to give her suitor any chance to curse. This reflected how looks mattered to Elizabeth.

³⁴ Count De Feria to the King, 18 April 1559, *CSP Spain*, I, 57-58.

woman who will only accept a great prince, and then they say she is in love with Lord Robert and never lets him leave her.”³⁵ The Bishop of Aquila also complained that “she makes her intimates think that she is favourable to the archduke’s affair, and her women all believe such to be the case, as do the people at large, but there is really no more in it than there was in the first day.”³⁶ Elizabeth’s lack of constancy in speech gave rise to an accusation which alleged that the Queen toyed with courtship by keeping up all marriage negotiations. The imperial ambassador Guzman De Silva suggested that “I don’t think anything is more enjoyable to this Queen than treating of marriage, although she assures me herself that nothing annoys her more. She is vain, and would like all the world to be running after her.”³⁷ He further alleged, “the Queen would like everyone to be in love with her, but I doubt whether she will ever be in love with anyone, enough to marry him.”³⁸

Elizabeth’s evasive and incompatible answers have provided historians with good sources to explore Elizabeth’s politics of courtship, and the analysis of her language become a means to prove her feminism or to argue the assumption that she determined to remain unmarried. For instance, Llonc Bell argues that “her highly unconventional politics of courtship redefined marriage and power from the woman’s point of view.”³⁹ In addition, modern scholars usually tend to argue that Elizabeth made use of the foreign courtships as the weapon for diplomatic intrigue, without any

³⁵ Count De Feria to the King, 29 April 1559, *CSP Spain*, I, 63.

³⁶ The Bishop of Aquila to the King, 30 May 1559, *CSP Spain*, I, 77.

³⁷ Guzman De Silva to the King, 20 August 1565, *CSP Spain*, I, 468.

³⁸ Guzman De Silva to the King, 18 March 1566, *CSP Spain*, I, 531.

³⁹ Bell, “Elizabeth I: Always Her own Free Woman,” 77.

intention of getting married. As Wallace MacCaffrey suggests, "she was determined not to marry, and was honest enough to make clear her personal preference for the single life."⁴⁰ Or as Christopher Haigh argues, Elizabeth determined not to marry when it became clearer that the hope to marry Dudley was diminished.⁴¹

In fact, whether Elizabeth's true intention was to marry or not is hardly answerable. Her uncertainty in her expressions might be better understood by her reluctance which consisted of two practical difficulties. First, an instinctive embarrassment existed in the marriage of ruling queens, which resulted from the Queen's gender. If she married a foreign prince, she would not accept an absent husband as agreed with her councillors, and would have to ask him to compromise his own religion with English Protestantism and not to aspire after the English Crown. Even so, people could not ensure that they can get rid of any fear of foreign domination. But, if Elizabeth married a native Englishman, Robert Dudley for example, the obstacle was that she would be unable to allay her nobility's jealousy and hostility towards him, and much less to avoid the division within her council. In short, whether she chose to marry within the realm or outside, she would have been unable to bring her country into a unity: marriage to a subject would provoke factionalism but marriage to a foreigner was unpopular and dangerous. This

⁴⁰ Wallace T. MacCaffrey, *Elizabeth I* (London: Edward Arnold, 1993), 98.

⁴¹ Haigh, *Elizabeth I*, 13.

predicament made William Camden hint that it was better for the Queen to remain unmarried,

. . . some were of opinion that she was fully resolved in her minde, that she might better provide both for the Common-wealth and her owne glory by an unmarried life than by marriage; foreseeing that if she married a subject she should draw dishonour upon her selfe by disparagement, and give fire to domesticall grudges and commotions; and if a stranger, she would subject both her selfe and her people under a foreign yoke, and endanger Religion.⁴²

Another difficulty arose from a personal fact that Elizabeth was short of any lead, of an authority such as parents to guide her. Francis Bacon recalled that Elizabeth had “no help to lean upon in her government, except such as she had herself provided; no own brother, no uncle, no kinsman of the royal family, to share her cares and support her authority.”⁴³ So unlike Mary, there was not any suitable person like Charles V to provide a parental authority to help her. The Privy Council might be able to represent a form of parental authority to guide Elizabeth if they could fully agree to support for a match. However, there was no suitor ever gained the united support of Elizabeth's councillors, either because of his own liabilities or the Council's division by factional political self-interests.⁴⁴ As J. E. Neale suggests, Elizabeth's “doubts might have disappeared if Court and Council had given a unanimous lead; but some were for one candidate, some for another. The result was

⁴² Camden, *Annales*, 236.

⁴³ Francis Bacon, “In Felicem Memoriam Elizabethae Angliae Reginae,” translated as “On the Fortunate Memory of Elizabeth Queen of England,” in *The Works of Francis Bacon*, eds. James Spedding, Robert Leslie Ellis, and Douglas Denon Heath, vol. 6 (London: Longman, 1858), 310.

⁴⁴ See Susan Doran, “Why Did Elizabeth Not Marry?” in *Dissing Elizabeth: Negative Representation of Gloriana*, ed. Julia M. Walker (Durham and London: Durham University Press, 1998), 41-46.

that she kept on hesitating.”⁴⁵ Therefore, we may argue that her cunning and evasiveness displayed less her determination of feminism or celibacy than her reluctance and confusion resulting from the problem of her gender and the division in the Council.

Apart from those difficulties, the lessons of two other queen regnants' marriages perhaps caused Elizabeth to be extremely cautious about her own choice. One is Mary, Queen of Scots, Elizabeth's fellow-monarch, who married James Hepburn, Earl of Bothwell, on 15 May 1567, after her second husband, Lord Darnley, was murdered in February. Mary's third marriage was conspicuously indiscreet, in terms of politics and her honour, because Bothwell was not only politically isolated, lacking real allies, but was also suspected of Darnley's murder. The marriage soon outraged Scottish nobles and gave rise to a rebellion. Mary's marriage with Bothwell was generally viewed as stupid, scandalous and unacceptable, even by Elizabeth who wrote frankly to Mary that “how could a worse choice be made for your honour than in such haste to marry such a subject, . . . And with what peril have you married him, that hath another lawful wife alive” Elizabeth saw no redemption in this marriage and suggested Mary to abandon it.⁴⁶ Mary did not pay attention to the advice. She was eventually forced to abdicate in July 1567 and then fled to England in 1568. The Scottish Queen's matrimonial decision reminded Elizabeth how a queen regnant who married unwisely would lose her people and

⁴⁵ Neale, *Queen Elizabeth*, 82.

⁴⁶ Elizabeth to Mary, 23 July 1567, Harrison, 50, 51.

nation, and this may have made her more ambivalent towards marriage. The other mirror for Elizabeth is her sister, Mary Tudor, whose marriage similarly made Elizabeth too mindful of the people's opinion to make a clear decision. Elizabeth was aware that Wyatt's rebellion in her sister's reign occurred when a queen regnant insisted upon taking a husband against the wishes of her important subjects. Ultimately, even though Elizabeth could formulate a cunning rhetoric of courtship, she was too cautious to make and insist upon any strong argument to support a marriage choice.

In fact, whether or not to marry was not an easy decision for Elizabeth. Even if she genuinely detested marriage, she was too mindful of the social expectation of a woman's role and a ruler's duty to justify any personal desire. In March 1565, Guzman De Siva told the Queen that he supposed that she would not wish to marry, Elizabeth answered that

For my own part I do not think such a conclusion is so clear as you say, although at that time I had a great idea not to marry, and I promise you, if I could to-day appoint such a successor to the Crown as would please me and the country I would not marry, as it is a thing for which I have never had any inclination. . . . There is a strong idea in the world that a woman cannot live unless she is married, or at all events that if she refrains from marriage she does so for some bad reason, But what can we do? We cannot cover everybody's mouth, but must content ourselves with doing our duty and trust in God.⁴⁷

Indeed, any of the Queen's choices needed mighty justification and argument in order to "cover everybody's mouth." But there were obvious difficulties for Elizabeth to simply fulfil all of her people's expectations, given the nation's disunity in thought

⁴⁷ Guzman De Silva to the King, 24 March 1565, *CSP Spain*, I, 409-10.

and belief, politically and religiously. Furthermore, despite that the Act of Queen's regal power had been passed by the Marian parliament in 1554, English people were never confident of queens' independence and autonomy either towards the first ruling queen or the second. The difficulties of Elizabeth's marriage remained and reached the culmination in her final courtship of François, Duke of Alençon.

III. The French Courtship in 1579

The French marriage negotiations had been proposed since 1564 while the Archduke's courtship was still going on. It was originated from Robert Dudley who disliked this match with the Archduke and negotiated secretly with the French ambassador to promote the King of France, Charles IX, in order to sabotage the Habsburg match. But the Queen did not show any interest in favour of the French matrimonial negotiations on account of the King's extreme youth. In 1564, Charles IX was only fourteen, yet the Queen's was thirty-one years old. Elizabeth herself was worried that she would look so ridiculous at the wedding that "people might say she had married her grandson; so that there was an end of it."⁴⁸ Nevertheless, to the end of the 1560s, Spanish interest in Mary Stuart and their repression of the revolt in the Netherlands had persuaded Elizabeth to favour a French alliance with the aim of paralysing French interference in dealing with Mary Stuart and Scotland.⁴⁹ The

⁴⁸ Guzman De Silva to the King, 13 July 1565, *CSP Spain*, I, 448.

⁴⁹ See Neale, *Queen Elizabeth*, 220-23; and Wallace T. MacCaffrey, *The Shaping of Elizabethan Regime* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1968), 392.

later proposal of marriage with the Duke of Anjou, later Henry III, was abandoned in January 1572 because of his uncompromising Catholicism. However, the alliance was still desired both by Elizabeth and the French Queen Mother, Catherine de Medici, and finally they concluded the Treaty of Blois in April 1572, which brought England and France into a defensive league against Spain.

Then the Queen Mother offered her other son, the Duke of Alençon, whose courtship was formally proposed in 1572. The obstacles were the same as his brother's wooing with the disparity of their age and religion. In 1572, the Queen was in her thirty-ninth year and the Duke was sixteen. As for the problem of religion, it had become a routine that once matrimonial negotiations had opened with a Catholic consort, the difficulties soon sprang out over the terms on which a Catholic consort could live in Protestant England. Even so, the Queen, because of the political need, seemed still interested in this courtship and hoped to see the Duke before they could settle a marriage.

Nothing came of it until 1579 when both sides suddenly took it more seriously with the changing political situation and the need to support the anti-Spanish forces in the Netherlands. In 1576, Alençon had crossed the frontier to the Flanders and formally took part in the wars against the Spanish army with the support of the Prince of Orange. In the beginning, the Queen utterly opposed Alençon's leadership in the Low Countries on behalf of the Dutch rebels, for she thought at this time he was supported by his brother, the French King, and it was contrary to her interests to have the French predomination in the Netherlands. But then, in January 1578, the rebels

in the Netherlands were decisively defeated by the Spanish army at the battle of Gembloux and needed imminently foreign military assistance. At the same time, Elizabeth learnt of the rift between Alençon and his brother, which would bring the Duke seeking her help. More and more, she saw the possibility of keeping herself out of the Netherlands, apart from material support, and to use the Duke as an instrument to sustain her intervention in the Netherlands.⁵⁰ The Earl of Sussex, agreeing with the Queen, suggested that only the bond of matrimony would make the Duke remain obedient and dependent; and marriage alone would forestall either Spanish or French domination in the Low Countries. For his part, Alençon, without any sign of his brother's backing, perceived that Elizabeth was the much-needed financial resource which could aid his military adventure in the Low Countries and regain his credibility with William of Orange. Anglo-French marriage negotiations were thus energetically reopened in the summer of 1578.⁵¹

The Duke of Alençon sent Jean de Simier, his Master of the Wardrobe, in January 1579, as his envoy to visit the Queen and arrange their meeting; and it was said that the Queen "is burning with impatience for his coming."⁵² The Duke came to England on 17 August, though heavily disguised. This was his first visit to his intended bride but also the first foreign suitor who came to see Elizabeth. She

⁵⁰ For the relationship between the French matrimonial negotiations and Elizabeth's foreign policy, see Wallace T. MacCaffrey, "The Anjou Match and the Making of Elizabethan Foreign Policy," in *The English Commonwealth 1547-1640: Essays in Politics and Society Presented to Joel Hurstfield*, eds. Peter Clark, Alan G. R. Smith and Nicholas Tyacke (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1979), 59-75.

⁵¹ See MacCaffrey, *Elizabeth I*, 198-99; and Doran, *Monarchy and Matrimony*, 154-55.

⁵² Bernardino De Mendoza to the King, 24 June 1579, *CSP Spain*, II, 680.

seemed soon deeply in favour of him. They exchanged many valuable gifts and she also gave him the nickname of "her frog," and kept exchanging love letters after he left. Alençon's letters declared that he was desolate and did nothing but wipe away the tears that "fell uninterruptedly from his eyes."⁵³ As the Queen, in one of her letters, wrote, "I confess that there is no Prince in the world to whom I would more willingly give myself than to yourself, nor to whom I think myself more bound, nor with whom I would pass the years of my life, both for your rare virtues and sweet nature."⁵⁴ Although her letters did not guarantee an unconditional promise of marriage, such emotional and devoted words seldom appeared in her conversations with other suitors. This time, her sincerity seemed much more than the consideration of political tactics and she also demonstrated unprecedentedly strong interest in marrying in the process of Alençon's wooing.

In addition to Elizabeth's willingness, the match at this moment also gained some support from conservative Protestants at court.⁵⁵ However, it was forcefully opposed by several other councillors, led by Dudley, stressing the Duke's religious difference. Dudley's objection actually resulted much more from his self-interest than the ideological concern over Protestantism, because he had not given up hope of marrying the Queen.⁵⁶ But his opposition based on religion grounds was echoed by a group of radical Protestants, both inside and outside the council. A few of them

⁵³ Neale, *Queen Elizabeth*, 241.

⁵⁴ Elizabeth to Francis, Duke of Alençon, December to January 1579-80, in Harrison, 136.

⁵⁵ Susan Doran indicates that many of those supports had been denied preferment by the Queen, including some of Sussex's kinsmen. See her *Monarchy and Matrimony*, 161.

⁵⁶ For Dudley's endeavour promoting himself as the candidate of Elizabeth's husband, see Doran "Juno versus Diana," 258-68.

even bravely expressed concern that the Queen might be seduced by her husband to alter her religious views.⁵⁷ The strong opposition to the marriage to a Roman Catholic continued to be the main obstacle for Elizabeth's French match.

The possibility of the marriage caused grave dissension in the court and council and two parties emerged when the issue was first debated in council in May 1579. One was led by the Earl of Sussex and William Cecil, Lord Burghley. They viewed Christian intermarriage between Protestants and Catholics as acceptable as they had supported the matrimonial negotiations with the Archduke Charles of Austria. With an optimistic expectation of Alençon's conversion to Protestantism, they declared the marriage as an indispensable cement of the alliance that would bind England and France together in a defensive league against Spain. The other party, with stronger support in the council, was led by Dudley, the Earl of Leicester, Christopher Hatton and Francis Walsingham. Their opposition to this match was equipped with the warning of both the Duke's Catholicism and the French domination. They argued that the entrance of a foreign Catholic prince would ruin the reformed religion and probably take the Queen abroad to live in his own territories or draw the Queen into wars of his own making. Furthermore, they expressed the apprehension if the Queen were to die in childbirth, her husband would act as regent with the authority to rule until the child reached maturity. They pointed out further how bad this talk of marriage was for both the Queen and the nation. As the Queen was already in her

⁵⁷ Doran, "Why Did Elizabeth not Marry?" 47.

forties, they indicated that "no succession could be hoped from it, and great confusion might be caused by the coming hither of Catholics, and above all Frenchmen, who were their ancient enemies."⁵⁸ Apparently, for them, France, not Spain, was England's ancient enemy; and it was Elizabeth who changed the English traditional diplomatic policy of alliance with the Habsburg, exemplified in the marriage of Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon.

These two parties also represented two different policies towards the Low Countries. The party of Lord Burghley, in agreement with the Queen, held a defensive view, arguing that England's interests relied on promoting an international balance of power. They disapproved of any active English military involvement in Netherlands but suggested giving some prudent assistance without arousing the unfriendly attentions of Spain or France. Contrasting with this defensive view, the party of the Earl of Leicester argued for a direct and active military intervention and financial support for the rebellious provinces in order to consolidate the reformed religion and free them from Spanish domination. So they endeavoured to persuade the Queen to take the States under her protection openly.⁵⁹

Actually, the allegations of Leicester's party about the Duke's religion were less important than that of his nationality in relation to stirring the popular dislike of a foreign match. Although in the reign of Mary most social malevolence towards foreigners had converged on the Spanish, none the less, a popular prejudice against

⁵⁸ Bernardino De Mendoza to the King, 14 May 1579, *CSP Spain*, II, 675.

⁵⁹ MacCaffrey, *Elizabeth I*, 190.

the French still existed and vastly prevailed over the prospect of the Queen's marriage with the French prince in 1579. A French match in effect was no more acceptable than a Spanish one for Tudor English people. At this point, Elizabeth would have made the same mistake as Mary if she had been determined to marry the Duke, regardless of her people's dislike of foreigners.

The coming of the Duke of Alençon in 1579 had affirmed people's anticipation that the marriage would take place, and at the same time, it gave rise to great fears of foreign infiltration as in the reign of Mary. It was ironic, when the Queen remained unmarried, people felt anxious about the dynastic succession, but should she approach marriage, they still felt uneasy, too. They begged the Queen to marry, but then begged her not to marry. So in a sense, the ruling queen's marriage was not only the queen's dilemma, but also the people's. One such fear was articulated in a sermon preached before the Queen, in March 1579 before the Duke's first visit. The sermon was reported by the Spanish ambassador Bernardino De Mendoza, indicating that the priest spoke vehemently against marriage with foreigners:

The preacher on the first Sunday in Lent said that marriages with foreigners would only result in ruin to the country, as was proved by what happened when the sainted King Edward died and was succeeded by Mary, who married a foreigner, and caused the martyrdom of so many persons, who were burnt all over the country.

The priest employed the case of Mary's foreign match which alienated the Queen from her native people to dissuade Elizabeth from the French match. The Queen was so displeased that she rose and left before the preacher finished the sermon.

which was considered "a great innovation."⁶⁰ People's anxiety was furthered by a widespread rumour, probably moved by the party of Leicester, that as soon as the Duke married the Queen he would attempt to get rid of her: then marry Mary Stuart and reign over both England and Scotland.⁶¹ De Mendoza also reported the obvious emotion of xenophobia in England, that "some are of opinion here that Alençon's coming may cause disturbances in this country, as the people are not favourable to the affair, and, indeed, they generally hate it."⁶² The marriage proposal thus incited a collective anxiety of foreign domination.

IV. The apology for England's national independence

The division in the Council, the difference of the Duke's religion and popular opposition to a foreign match, all increasingly molested Elizabeth and made her hesitant to marry the French Prince in 1579. The most vociferous attack on the French match came with the publication of John Stubbs's *The Discoverie of A Gaping Gulf Whereinto England is like to be Swallowed by an other French mariage*.⁶³ Stubbs, a Cambridge graduate, had showed his leanings towards

⁶⁰ Bernardino De Mendoza to the King, 31 March 1579, *CSP Spain*, II, 658.

⁶¹ Bernardino De Mendoza to the King, 8 April 1579, *CSP Spain*, II, 663.

⁶² Bernardino De Mendoza to the King, 24 June 1579, *CSP Spain*, II, 680.

⁶³ John Stubbs's *The Discoverie of A Gaping Gulf Whereinto England is like to be Swallowed by an other French mariage* was printed by C. Barker in London 1579 (STC 23400). It was reprinted by the Folger Shakespeare Library in *John Stubbs's Gaping Gulf with Letters and Other Relevant Documents*, ed. Lloyd E. Berry (Charlottesville: the University Press of Virginia for the Folger Shakespeare Library, 1968). All the reference in this chapter were based on the version of the Folger Shakespeare Library.

Puritanism when he was a member of Lincoln's Inn, and his sister was married to the famous Puritan leader Thomas Cartwright.⁶⁴

On 18 August 1579 or thereabouts, a thousand copies of Stubbs's book were secretly printed in London. It was even reported that William, a London gentleman, sent fifty copies to a friend in Cornwall with instructions to distribute this book to friends.⁶⁵ This work had begun circulating in London and spread out to other parts of the country, while the Queen was still vacillating between her rival councillors and her own affection for the Duke. Not until a month later did the Queen find this intrepid insult to her matrimonial policy in this book. She immediately commanded all the copies of this book to be confiscated, and the author, the booksellers, William Page, and the printer, Singleton, to be promptly arrested.⁶⁶

A proclamation was formally issued on 27 September by the Queen to prohibit the circulation of *Gaping Gulf* and to refute its contemptuous accusations against Alençon and the Queen. The Spanish ambassador reported that "as the proclamation was only dated two days before its promulgation (which was carried out with great ceremony) people are attaching a good deal of importance to it, and are saying that it was advisable to cut short the sensation caused by the book, in order to effect the marriage."⁶⁷ The Queen's hasty reaction reflected that Stubbs's work had

⁶⁴ For the life of John Stubbs see the introduction of *John Stubbs's Gaping Gulf*, xx-vi.

⁶⁵ Ilona Bell, "'Souereaigne Lord of lordly Lady of this land': Elizabeth, Stubbs, and the *Gaping Gulf*," in *Dissing Elizabeth*, 99, 100.

⁶⁶ Bernardino De Mendoza to the King, 25 September 1579, *CSP Spain*, II, 700.

⁶⁷ Bernardino De Mendoza to the King, 29 September 1579, *CSP Spain*, II, 700.

reached a wide circulation and excited considerable notice and resonance. As the Venetian ambassador in France reported, this book "has excited the feelings of many individuals, who say openly that they will not consent in Parliament to this marriage."⁶⁸ The Queen's reaction therefore also demonstrated her fear that this book might give rise to fervent public opposition to the marriage.

Eventually, both the author and bookseller were put on trial at Westminster on 13 October on the charge of having disseminated seditious writings. They were sentenced to have their right hands cut off. The sentence was carried out at Westminster on 3 November. William Camden noted that when Stubbs, having his right hand cut off, he took off his hat with his left hand, and said in a loud voice "God save the Queene."⁶⁹ The mood of those people who watched this spectacle was agonised and moved. According to Camden's record, "the multitude standing about was altogether silent, either out of horror of this new and unwonted punishment, or else out of pity towards the man, being of most honest and unblameable report, or else out of hatred of the marriage, which most men presaged would be the overthrow of Religion."⁷⁰ Obviously, the official suppression did not achieve its purpose, instead, many people felt sympathetic to what happened to Stubbs. Even outside England, Villiers, from Antwerp, wrote to Davison that "All honest folk here are very sorry for what has happened to Mr. Stubbs."⁷¹

⁶⁸ Hieronimo Lippomano to the Signory, 23 October 1579, *CSP Ven.*, VII, 621.

⁶⁹ Camden, *Annales*, 239.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

⁷¹ Villiers to Davison, 20 November 1579, *CSP Foreign*, 95.

Soon in November or December, John Stubbs's point of view was reinforced by Sir Philip Sidney's letter to the Queen against the proposed marriage. There is a strong suggestion that Sidney had read Stubbs's work with great care when constructing his own argument.⁷² Sidney's letter was circulated in manuscript only, but in a fairly wide circle. In order to avoid the Queen's displeasure, Sidney constructed his letter as politely as possible, like the private counsel of a courtier, in order to cause less offence to the Queen. Aside from that, his letter primarily gave advice to the Queen and was circulated inside the court, unlike Stubbs's book which not only addressed to the Queen but also and primarily to the people and intended to sway public opinion. Sidney, therefore, could deliver himself from the horrific punishment of John Stubbs.⁷³

It is believed that both Stubbs and Sidney had strong connections with the party of Leicester. Sidney was the Earl of Leicester's nephew and in 1583 became Sir Francis Walsingham's son-in-law by his marriage to Frances Walsingham. From a letter of Hubert Languet we learn that it was probably Walsingham who strongly encouraged Sidney to write this letter to the Queen, as spokesman for the party, to oppose her marriage with Alençon.⁷⁴ Stubbs's relationship to this party was not so

⁷² Sir Philip Sidney, *Miscellaneous Prose*, ed. Katherine Duncan-Jones and Jan Van Doresten (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), 35-37.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 33-34.

⁷⁴ Hubert Languet writes: ". . . Since however you were ordered to write as you did by those whom you were bound to obey, no fair-judging man can blame you for putting forward freely what you thought good for your country, nor even for exaggerating some circumstances in order to convince them of what you judged expedient." See Steuart A. Pears ed., *The Correspondence of Sir Philip Sidney and Hubert Languet* (London: 1845), 187.

certain, but he apparently held the same point of view with regard to the policy in the Low Countries. He satirically disdained the tactic of bridling the French by marriage and suggested vigorously that England should aid the Low Countries with their own men and swords, rather than "put our sword into another hand."⁷⁵ In addition, it was said that Walsingham had something to do with Stubbs's *Gaping Gulf*, perhaps even as its promoter.⁷⁶ Therefore, we can view the works of Stubbs and Sidney as a unit, and perhaps Stubbs and Sidney orchestrated with the party of Leicester in order to manipulate the Queen's decision.

Both works reflected the view of Leicester's party in the Council and the essence of popular objection to the French match. Basically, they presented the formulation of Elizabethan Protestants' discourse of opposition to the Queen's marriage. John Stubbs formulates his contention cogently, linking a passionate religious commitment and zealous national sentiment, with an element of ardent love for the Queen. First of all, he draws clear contradictions between England and France in terms of religion. England is the paradise and Elizabeth is "our Eve" and also "our Adam and sovereign lord or lordly lady of this land." Yet France is the serpent, "not Satan in body of a serpent, but the old serpent in shape of man," who endeavoured to seduce our Eve that "she and we may lose this English paradise."⁷⁷

⁷⁵ Stubbs, *A Gaping Gulf*, 82.

⁷⁶ According to the Venetian ambassador in Paris, Walsingham was banished from the court by the Queen in October 1579 because he "had knowledge of this affair." See Hieronimo Lippomano to the Signory, 27 October 1579, *CSP Ven.*, VII, 621.

⁷⁷ Stubbs, *A Gaping Gulf*, 3-4.

Furthermore, England is likened to the kingdom of Israel, "a kingdom of light, confessing Christ and serving the living God;" France on the contrary, is "a kingdom of darkness, confessing Belial and serving Baal." Thus England and France are two totally different spheres. One is bright, pure and religious, but the other is dark, evil, and hypocritic; one is the city of God, an elected and sanctified land, but the other is the city of man, degenerate and corrupt.

Subsequently, Stubbs points out that legitimate marriage is "between pairs in religion, and in the fear of God," and that God "fobade those matches wherein the sons of God were given to the daughters of men."⁷⁸ Since England and France are two different spheres in respect of religion, should the Queen's marriage with the French Duke go ahead it would draw the daughter of God to match the son of men, to give the faithful to the unfaithful, which is a thing forbidden by the law of God.

it is a sin, a great and mighty sin, for England to give one of Israel's daughters to any of Hanmor's sons [Gen. 34:1-29], to match a daughter of God with one of the sons of men, to couple a Christian lady, a member of Christ, to a prince and good son of Rome, that anti-Christian mother city.⁷⁹

The contradictions between the two countries obviously represent a hierarchy where England is higher and France is lower. But for Stubbs, this hierarchy is not only religious, but also moral. As those Protestant pamphleteers attacked Philip's lechery in the reign of Mary, Stubbs indicates the fact that the Duke was believed to have syphilis which perfectly signifies God's punishment for his licentious life. In a

⁷⁸ Ibid., 7.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 6.

way, this was Protestant prejudice towards Catholic sexual irregularity in the sixteenth century. However, like the works of Marian Protestants, the lower moral standards and the cruelty of the country of the intended bridegroom were a significant element in Elizabethan Protestant objections to the French match and to foreign rule.

Stubbs was very keen on demonstrating the evils and cruelty of the royal house of France. "France is a house of cruelty," he reminds his readers, referring to the massacre of St Bartholomew's day in 1572 in the event of marriage between Henry of Navarre and Marguerite of Valois. In this respect, Philip Sidney also provided his first-sight experience in Paris of this fatal day in his letter to the Queen.⁸⁰ Stubbs and Sidney both, reminding the readers of that brutal massacre happened just seven years ago, use the emotive event to incite English Protestants' anger against Catholicism and people's hatred and fear of French rule. Stubbs attributes most of the bloody slaughter and villainous persecution to the French Queen Mother, "the dangerous practicer in marriages."⁸¹ The Queen Mother, from the house of Medici, is conveniently identified as the Italian and Popish agent in France. Her court is the most "Christian court where Machiavelli is their New Testament and atheism is their religion," where the Pope moves her soul to devise and execute all mischief to other princes, under the pretence of friendship and marriage.⁸² By the same reasoning, Stubbs believes, the Duke, a devoted Papist, is supported and used by his mother and

⁸⁰ Philip Sidney, *A Discourse of Syr PH. S. to the Queenes Majesty Touching hir Mariage with Monsieur*, in *The Complete Works of Sir Philip Sidney*, III, *The Defence of Poesie Political Discourse Correspondence Translation*, ed. Albert Feuillerat (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1923), 52.

⁸¹ Stubbs, *A Gaping Gulf*, 25.

⁸² *Ibid.*, 76, 27-29.

the Pope, to come to England to cast away the reformed religion under cloak of marriage.

Sidney, echoing Stubbs's view, indicates that the Duke is an ill-qualified consort;

His will to be as full of light ambition as is possible, besides the frenche disposicion, & his owne education, his inconstant attemptes against his brother, his thrusting him self into the low countrey matters, he sometime seeking the king of Spaine daughter sometime your Majesty are evident testimonies of a light mind carried with every wind of hope⁸³

More horrifyingly, Stubbs is convinced that the whole talk of marriage was Papist practice through France, a collusion linking the Duke, Mary Queen of Scots, and the Pope, because "from no place more fitly than out of France can they fetch this instrument of our woe. France is a neighbour, therefore convenient by the place."⁸⁴

After their detraction of the house of France, Stubbs and Sidney come to the discussion of the danger of foreign domination to incite further the mood of English patriotism. Stubbs is convinced that it is a poison for any nation to receive an alien governor because "a senseless and careless foreigner cannot have the natural and brotherlike bowels of tender love towards this people which is required in a governor."⁸⁵ Sidney also warns the Queen that if Alençon did come, "he must live here in farr meaner reputacion then his minde will well brooke, having no other Royalty to countenance himself with or els you must deliver him the keys of your

⁸³ Sidney, *A Discourse*, 53-54.

⁸⁴ Stubbs, *A Gaping Gulf*, 79.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 34.

kingdom & live at his discretion," then all English people had to live under the bondage of France.⁸⁶

It is noticeable that Stubbs uses the traditional constructions of the female sex to enhance his arguments, in order to further prove the inevitability of foreign supremacy. He stated that,

if woman, that weaker vessel, be strong enough to draw man through the advantage which the Devil hath within our bosom . . . , how much more forcibly shall the stronger vessel pull weal woman, considering that with the inequality of strength there is joined as great or more readiness to idolatry and superstition? And if the husband, which he is the head, be drawn aside by his wife, over whom nevertheless he hath authoirty and rule, how much more easily shall the wife be perverted by her husband, to whom she is subject by the law of God and oweth both awe and obedience, howsoever the laws by prerogative or her place by pre-eminence may privilege her?⁸⁷

He does not see, nor would like to see, any possibility that the Queen can function independently from her husband after the marriage. No matter how the laws privileged the Queen's authority, Stubbs believes that she, being a woman, is deemed to be the weaker vessel, and through marriage, the Duke should be her owner, "possess our Queen, the chief officer in England," thus the land is under his control as well.

For if he marry her with that good love on both parts, . . . , yet shall he bear a great sway with her who bears all the sway with us, and if he do not love her (the Lord keep her from proving) then must she fear him, so as for fear or love he will rule her and the whole land for her sake.⁸⁸

⁸⁶ Sidney, *A Discourse*, 55.

⁸⁷ Stubbs, *A Gaping Gulf*, 11.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 37-38.

Furthermore, he indicates that should the Duke become the King of France, which was very possible since he was the brother of a childless French King. Henry III, he must go back to his native country,

then, by all likelihood, either must our Elizabeth go with him out of her own native country and sweet soil of England, . . . , into a foreign kingdom where her writ doth not run and shall be but in a borrowed majesty as the moon to the sun, shining by night as other kings' wives, . . . , and we poor subjects that have been governed hitherto by a natural mother shall be overlooked at home by some cruel and proud governor, or else must she tarry here without comfort of her husband, seeing herself despised or not wifelike esteemed and as an eclipsed sun diminished in sovereignty⁸⁹

Therefore, if the marriage went ahead, the Queen would not be the *de facto* ruler any more, and the English people would be brought into slavery by the French.

The weakness of the Queen's gender is thus intertwined with the prospect that England would lose its liberty and independence, and it becomes the basis of Stubbs's discourse of opposition.⁹⁰ Recounting the story of Mary's marriage, reheating the fear of the foreign entourage, Stubbs is deeply conscious of the disadvantage resulting from the fact that Elizabeth is a woman, as he states, "in this marriage our Queen is to be married, and both she and we poor souls are to be mastered, and which is worse, mistressed to."⁹¹ His words reflected a collective anxiety of the English people that, through the Queen's marriage, the whole country would be put into the possession of a foreign master, a husband. His idea sounds as

⁸⁹ Ibid., 49.

⁹⁰ Ilona Bell suggests that Stubbs's work "brings to light a deep-seated distrust of female rule which had taken root within an important strata of the English political nation." See her "'Sovereign Lord of lordly Lady of this land': Elizabeth, Stubbs, and the *Gaping Gulf*," 113.

⁹¹ Stubbs, *A Gaping Gulf*, 58.

though the English people themselves achieved the status of a married woman by their queen regnant's matrimony, bearing wifely obedience and submission to their husband/the Queen's husband, not only religiously, but also economically and politically.⁹²

Another theme in the works of Stubbs and Sidney identifies the Queen with the Protestant Church. For them and many other English Protestants, "the first and chief benefit" that Elizabeth had done for this kingdom was that she redeemed it from a foreign king, Philip II, and therefore liberated the country from the Spanish yoke, which "made her subjects in love with her the very first of her reign." Now, Stubbs wonders, how could the Queen mercilessly bring upon her people an ancient enemy, "a more dangerous foreigner and more to their discontentation, to leave them in worse case than they were found?"⁹³ Sidney, too, reminds the Queen of her role as the protector of true faith, "how their [Protestants'] hartes will be galed, if not aliened, when they shall see you take to husband a frenchman & a papist, in whome howsoever fine wittes may finde either further daunger or painted excuses, yet very common people will know this that he is the soone of that Jezabel of our age."⁹⁴

Finally, the marriage is rejected for the sake of the Queen's life. Given the marriage was grounded in expecting an heir from the Queen's body, Stubbs warns "how exceedingly dangerous" it would be for the queen, being forty-seven years old, to have a child. Suppose the Queen died in childbearing, who would succeed? If

⁹² See *ibid.*, 90.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 36.

⁹⁴ Sidney, *A Discourse*, 52.

her infant did not survive, the land must leave “a spoil to foreign invasion and as a stack of wood to civil wars.” Or if the infant survived, male or female, England would hazard its state for putting into the hands of the father, therefore England had to submit to the control of France, like Spain's Naples, Sicily and the Low Countries.⁹⁵ Sidney, on the other hand, does not argue directly that Elizabeth would die in childbirth as Stubbs does. But he suggests that the length of government is a more important issue than the uncertainty of succession, “examples of all good Princes doe ever confirme this, who the longer they reigned the deper they sancke still in their subjectes hartes.” As long as a prince could bring to his people peace and liberty by his “Virtue & justice” which “are the onely bondes of the peoples love,” Sidney argues, having a successor from the prince's own body was not essential. Therefore a marriage is not necessary for the Queen. Although Sidney does not express this idea explicitly, he states, “not that I denye the blisse of children, but onely meane to shew religion & equity to be of themselves sufficient stayes.”⁹⁶

Concerning the necessity of marriage, both Stubbs and Sidney do not explicitly suggest that the Queen remain a virgin. Stubbs, on the one hand, does not ask the Queen to remain single, yet desiring “that Her Majesty should marry with such a house and such a person as had not provoked the great vengeance of the Lord.” On the other hand, nevertheless, he does not wish Elizabeth merely to play the traditional role of a woman, to fulfil the common duty of a wife or a queen consort who “as the

⁹⁵ Stubbs, *A Gaping Gulf*, 52, 53.

⁹⁶ Sidney, *A Discourse*, 57, 58.

moon to the sun, shining by night as other king's wives."⁹⁷ In his eyes, Elizabeth is both Eve and Adam and therefore should be both King and Queen. She is self-content; she does not need a man as long as she can be the spouse of the Lord God (like the Virgin Mary), the supporter of the reformed Church.

In a way, both Stubbs and Sidney had developed their theory to the conclusion, though somewhat ambiguous, that the Queen could stay in her present state, without a husband and a child, but glorified in her reign by good government and love of her people.⁹⁸ Yet, even though both writers are only too alert to the disadvantages posed by the sex of their ruler, they do not object to the female rule *per se*, as had certain Protestant writers, such as John Ponet and Christopher Goodman. It perhaps results from the fact that all the claimants for the throne were women, and more importantly, Elizabeth was the only sure foundation for English Protestantism. Stubbs and Sidney were aware of the dangers that could come to English Protestantism if Elizabeth's position was weakened. Therefore, they heaped detraction and condemnation upon the Duke and those who pursued this marriage.

Stubbs and Sidney, through their opposition, contributed to the development of the association of the Queen with the English Church and State. They argue that the Queen's princely duty consists in upholding the Protestant religion and preserving the liberty and safety of England. Stubbs thereby beseeches the Queen to keep showing

⁹⁷ Stubbs, *A Gaping Gulf*, 49.

⁹⁸ Sidney, *A Discourse*, 59.

herself a zealous prince for God's gospel to the end. to advance and sustain the reformed religion, and "foresee, in a tender love to this people committed to your government, the continuance of the truth among them and their posterity."⁹⁹ Sidney also begs the Queen that "for your standing alone you must take it as a singular honour God hath done you, to be indeed the onely protectour of his Church;" and "do not raze out the impression you have made in such a multitude of heartes, lett not the scume of such vile mindes beare any witnesse against your subjectes devotion."¹⁰⁰ Ultimately, both of them remind the Queen that the people's will and their benefit should be her first consideration in her marriage as she herself had stated "no private pleasure nor self affection coulde leade you unto it."¹⁰¹ Aside from that, they also remind the Queen of her dislike for marriage that she had herself expressed since her youth, the Queen therefore should immediately terminate any further negotiation with France.

On the whole, although Stubbs and Sidney set out to speak for the policy of the party of Leicester, they do not confine themselves to advancing the political interests of that party, nor raise the Earl of Leicester as a proper and respectable candidate to be the Queen's husband. Primarily, they broaden the course of religion to a national term—the national independence of England—focusing on the issues of foreign takeover and the Queen's princely duty to her people's will. If the Queen married

⁹⁹ Stubbs, *A Gaping Gulf*, 29.

¹⁰⁰ Sidney, *A Discourse*, 60, 59.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 55.

the foreign Catholic Duke, the writers imply, it was a straightforward betrayal of her nation and people.

Their works indeed manifested a turning point that, in the Elizabethan Protestants' glorification of Elizabeth, the Queen's virginity became a preferable state to matrimony. This trend was expressed by multiple media including pamphlets, sermons, poems, and paintings in the following years. Susan Doran argues that Elizabeth's visit to Norwich in the summer of 1578 demonstrated a new departure in Elizabethan entertainments, which for the first time urged Elizabeth to remain single and celebrated her chastity as the Virgin Queen.¹⁰² However, on this occasion in 1578, the entertainments actually displayed more uncertainty over whether Elizabeth should marry or remain a virgin than a clear appeal to the Queen, and it made much use of classical goddesses and biblical heroines in addition to the Virgin Mary.¹⁰³ It was not until 1579 that there was a Protestant outcry against the French match, including Edmund Spenser's *The Shepheardes Calendar* and *Prosopopoia: or a Mother Hubberds Tale*, John Lyly's *Euphues and his England*, George Puttenham's *Partheniades* or "virgin-songs," the series of Sieve portraits of Elizabeth as a virgin, and of course, Stubbs's and Sidney's works. They altogether, more or less, suggest the Queen remain single for fulfilling her religious and princely commitment to the English Church and people. Afterwards, there was an increasing

¹⁰² Doran, "Juno versus Diana," 270-72.

¹⁰³ Helen Hackett, *Virgin Mother, Maiden Queen: Elizabeth I and the Cult of the Virgin Mary* (London: Macmillan Press, 1995), 96-98; King, "Queen Elizabeth I: Representations of the Virgin Queen," 47-48.

tendency to celebrate Elizabeth's perpetual virginity as well as of a cult of the Virgin Mary.

Simultaneously, their works demonstrated a close connection between the Protestant religion and the English sense of nationhood with which Protestants analogised England as new Israel and the English people as God's "chosen people."¹⁰⁴ The year 1579, hence, also marked a corner stone of the English sense of nationhood. Stubbs and Sidney provoked a popular apprehension of foreign domination and linked the independence of the Queen tightly with that of the Church and State. They seemed to represent the Church and State by the Queen's virginity and viewed the intactness of Elizabeth as the intactness of English Protestantism and nation, away from foreign Catholic pollution and subjugation. Therefore a patriotic cult of the Queen was increasingly celebrated after 1579.

V. The Queen's defence and the end of the French courtship

After the publication of Stubbs's *Gaping Gulf*, Burghley tried to organise a counter-propaganda campaign, but only a couple of pamphlets were written and they remained unprinted and plainly had only a very limited circulation.¹⁰⁵ Even Lord Henry Howard, Earl of Northampton's *Answer to Stubb's Book against Queen*

¹⁰⁴ See Patrick Collinson, "A Chosen People? The English Church and the Reformation," *History Today* 36 (1986): 14-20. Also see his "The Elizabethan Church and the New Religion," in *The Reign of Elizabeth I*, ed. Christopher Haigh (London, Macmillan, 1984), 169-94.

¹⁰⁵ Doran, *Monarchy and Matrimony*, 168.

Elizabeth's Marriage, that appeared in several manuscripts in 1580, had little impact.¹⁰⁶ Only Elizabeth's Royal Proclamation was widely disseminated. Frederic Youngs pinpoints that this was the only time during her reign, "Elizabeth used a royal proclamation to refute rather than merely to suppress a dissident religious book."¹⁰⁷ Elizabeth, in her proclamation, defended her choice of marriage and suitor. She considered the author as an iniquitous sower of discord, and the book, "a lewd, seditious book," because, first, it unjustly irritated a foreign prince who "entirely loved and honored her;" and second, it alienated the love and estimation of her people, rousing them to a fear that she would restore Catholicism and that her government would be controlled by foreigners.

Elizabeth refuted those allegations vigorously, focusing on the issues of religion and foreign domination, that

she hath done from the beginning, in restoring and maintaining of the true Christian religion, and of a long and universal peace in her dominions against all attempts of foreign enemies and conspiracies of rebels; governing her estate in that sort as her realm is and hath been free always from outward hostility and war made or denounced by any foreign prince.¹⁰⁸

This proclamation showed the Queen's zealous support of the English Church as Stubbs begged, but did not acknowledge the fearful danger to her own person, to the course of religion and to the whole estate of the realm, that could result from her marriage. On the contrary, the marriage was "the only remedy to avoid all the perils

¹⁰⁶ His work was reprinted in Berry ed. *John Stubbs's Gaping Gulf*, Appendix II, 153-194.

¹⁰⁷ Frederic A. Youngs, *The Proclamations of the Tudor Queens* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 208.

¹⁰⁸ *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, II, 446-47, 445-46.

now threatened by this seditious writing, and namely to avoid all such or greater civil wars and bloodsheds as betwixt the Houses of York and Lancaster.”¹⁰⁹

Upon the theme of princely duty, the Queen strongly reproached Stubbs's book for traitorously and seditiously diminishing “her majesty's credit with her good people,” whilst never touching on her “motherly and princely care” for her subjects. This proclamation reaffirmed that even if the Queen married, her princely care would not dwindle, for the marriage was not only profitable to her but also to the realm.¹¹⁰ Paralleling her first parliamentary speech, recorded by William Camden, those words emphasise again the Queen as both prince and mother to her people. Elizabeth suggested that her wifely position would never suppress or substitute her princely responsibility for her subjects and her commitment to the nation.

However, Elizabeth did not seriously deal with the problem of the people's will in her proclamation, nor did she acknowledge the fact that the majority of her subjects disliked a foreign match. Her proclamation and somewhat despotic activity toward the writer of *Gaping Gulf* did not produce the desired effect. “The proclamation I sent on the 29th,” the Spanish ambassador wrote to Philip II, “instead of mitigating the public indignation against the French, has irritated it and fanned the flame.” The Queen was therefore forced to summon the whole of the Council again to give her opinion with regard to the marriage on 7 October.¹¹¹ The councillors' opinions still formed two poles and offered no conclusion. Five councillors led by

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 448.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., 449.

¹¹¹ Bernardino De Mendoza to the King, 16 October 1579, *CSP Spain*, II, 702.

Burghley agreed with this marriage, but Leicester and Hatton with the other five were against it. It is noticeable how the arguments of the dissident councillors paralleled those of John Stubbs and Philip Sidney. Their opposition was framed in three respects aside from the problem of religion: the safety of the Queen's life; the tranquillity of the realm and the preservation of the Crown; and the public opinion against the marriage.

Those councillors specifically manipulated the anxiety about the loss of English independence, pointing out that the French were the "ancient enemies" of the English. "If she were to die, as might be feared if the French were to obtain control of her person," they declared that the French "would take possession of the country, with the aid they would get from Scotland, without the English being able to prevent it." Furthermore, they emphasised the people's hatred of foreigners in order to thwart the Queen's matrimonial negotiations, stating that "although she had been so popular with her subjects in consequence of her actions during the years she had reigned, . . . on this matter they showed such bitter hatred." In consequence of the general hostility of the people towards the French, the councillors suggested that the Queen should postpone Parliament, "in order to avoid disturbance and sedition."¹¹²

After the discussion with her councillors in October, the Queen "remained extremely sad after the conversation and was so cross and melancholy that it was noticed by everyone who approached her." The Lord Burghley also reported that

¹¹² Ibid., 702, 703.

the Queen uttered many speeches “not without shedding of many tears.”¹¹³ Her emotional reaction clearly exhibited her desire to conclude the marriage, yet being short of general consent of her councillors, and lacking any authoritative guide, she could only keep the issue between herself and the councillors. Elizabeth eventually could only thwart her own desires and frustrate her own ambitions since as Wallace MacCaffrey suggests, she was “too acutely shrewd to press an unpopular marriage against a tide of popular disapproval, ” and she knew she must retreat at this moment.¹¹⁴

Generally, the Queen was hesitant and over-cautious rather than affirmative and confident in her determination of marriage. She kept wandering helplessly between marriage and remaining single. On one occasion, Elizabeth asked the Archbishop of York for his opinion:

My lord, here I am between Scylla and Charybdis. Alençon has agreed to all the terms I sent him, and he is asking me to tell him when I wish him to come and marry me. If I do not marry him, I do not know whether he will remain friendly with me; and if I do, I shall not be able to govern the country with the freedom and security that I have hitherto enjoyed. What shall I do?¹¹⁵

The Archbishop suggested that the Queen follow her own inclination either to marry or not. Nevertheless, she seemed never to be convinced that her personal inclination alone could justify any decision, nor did she ever raise the idea of “free choice” of princes’ marriage as had Mary Tudor. In addition, she could not neglect

¹¹³ Ibid. William Cecil’s report see *Salisbury Manuscripts*, II (London: HMSO, 1888), 272.

¹¹⁴ MacCaffrey, *Elizabeth I*, 206.

¹¹⁵ Bernardino De Mendoza to the King, 28 February 1580, *CSP Spain*, III, 14.

the danger that she might be deposed by imposing her own determination upon her people.¹¹⁶

Alençon's courtship was therefore temporarily stifled by the end of 1579, but the new situation in the Netherlands—Alençon's acceptance as governor by the States General—reopened the marriage negotiation in 1581. In June 1581, Elizabeth wrote to him again in a tone of zealous love:

I refer all to your good judgment, postponing all impeachments, and stopping my ears to the Sirens that by fair persuasions of my own advantage have somewhat retarded the marriage, considering my age, which could easily make me believe, if there were no other reason, that this conclusion would be very convenient for me.¹¹⁷

Encouraged by the Queen's ardency and the need of aid, Alençon visited England again in November 1581. In this visit, Alençon was triumphant in gaining the Queen's promise and the pledge of her ring. According to the Spanish ambassador's report, when the Queen and Alençon were walking together in a gallery, Leicester and Walsingham being present, the French ambassador entered and said that he wished to know the Queen's intention so that he could write to his master with her answer. She replied, "You may write this to the King: that the Duke of Alençon shall be my husband." At the same moment, "she turned to the Duke and

¹¹⁶ According Bernardino De Mendoza's report, the Queen was threatened and was to understand that "when she proposed to marry, Parliament would urge her to declare an heir to the Crown, as the people did not wish, in case of her death, to find themselves in the present position with their enemies within their own gates." Moreover, "She has been greatly alarmed by all this, as she has been given to understand that as soon as a successor is appointed they will upset her." See *CSP Spain*, II, 703, 705.

¹¹⁷ Elizabeth to Francis, Duke of Alençon, May 1581, in Harrison, 146. The Duke's second visit was in June 1581.

kissed him on the mouth, drawing a ring from her own hand and giving it to him as a pledge,” and Alençon gave her a ring of his in return. Shortly afterwards, “the Queen summoned the ladies and gentlemen from the presence chamber to the gallery, repeating to them in a loud voice, in Alençon’s presence, what she had previously said.”¹¹⁸

After this significant scene of the Queen’s giving her ring to Alençon on 22 November 1581, most people in England believed that the Queen would soon marry.¹¹⁹ Elizabeth then had to face another torrent of anguished opposition from her councillors. First, Sir Christopher Hatton spoke to the Queen boldly that “even if she herself wished to marry, she ought to consider the grief she would bring upon the country by doing so, not to mention what might happen to her personally if she married against the wish of her people, upon whose affection the security of her throne depended.” Then the Earl of Leicester, who had prepared to incite the people of London to rise if the marriage was carried forward, approached the Queen as to “whether she was a maid or a woman,” after she gave the ring to the Duke. She replied that she was a “maid.” Elizabeth promised Leicester more clearly that she would send a message to the Duke, saying that “she had been thinking of the ring she had given him, and she was sure that if she married him she would not have long to live,” due to the conspicuous dissatisfaction of the English people. Furthermore, Elizabeth in the same message would ask the Duke to allow her to defer this

¹¹⁸ Bernardino De Mendoza to the King, 24 November 1581, *CSP Spain*, III. 226.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 227. However, the Spanish Ambassador was convinced that this marriage would be by no means concluded.

marriage, but stressing that "she would be very much more attached to him as a friend even than if he were her husband."¹²⁰ The Queen's matrimonial promise to Alençon, confronting the opposition of Hatton and Leicester, was thus immediately substituted by this ambiguous promise of friendship, and the ring became a mere pledge of perpetual friendship. Here it showed again how Elizabeth's action and determination were circumscribed by her councillors, who were powerful in her government and claimed to represent the people's will.

Elizabeth, in order to satisfy further her councillors and refute resolutely Alençon's wooing, returned to her old saying that "she was entirely free from any matrimonial engagements, and on the contrary was desirous of remaining in her present state, until she could at all events overcome her natural hatred to marriage;" and even begged Alençon "to accept her as a friend and sister, without thinking of her as a wife." Likewise, she also expressed her hatred of the idea of marriage to the supporters of this marriage, the Lord Treasurer and the Earl of Sussex. De Mendoza in the end of December wrote that "the Queen displays every day further signs of her never having intended to marry Alençon."¹²¹ Nevertheless, the course of Alençon's courtship remained ambiguous and undetermined after 1581 as the situation in the Low Countries was still urgent. In response, most English councillors kept to their objections and the Queen's attitude remained fluctuating and reluctant.

¹²⁰ Bernardino De Mendoza to the King, 4 December 1581, *CSP Spain*, III, 229.

¹²¹ Bernardino De Mendoza to the King, 25 December 1581, *CSP Spain*, III, 243; and 29 December 1581, *CSP Spain*, III, 251.

Sometimes, Elizabeth displayed a fervent desire towards marriage for personal reasons, "to have a companion in the government to enable her to bridle the insolence of her favourites, which she could not do by any other means:" or, she said, "she would not live an hour longer but for the hope of soon seeing Alençon again, as she was now determined to marry him in spite of all opposition." Moreover, she even told Alençon to address her as "my wife the Queen of England" when he wrote to her.¹²² Not surprisingly, her desires were again thwarted by the lack of united conciliar support. The arguments of opposition persistently reiterated those drawn by John Stubbs and Philip Sidney, focusing on religion and liberty of the realm and linking the English Church/State/Queen altogether. Leicester and Hatton contended that the marriage was "against God's service," since Alençon was of a different religion to the Queen, which might arouse a multitude of Catholics in England by giving them "a chief of their own faith," and cause the change of religion. They also reminded the Queen of how unpopular the marriage was, warning that "a general tumult might be feared."¹²³ More significantly, a previous supporter of the marriage, the Earl of Sussex, became hesitant and even hinted that virginity would be a better status for the Queen than marriage, in accordance with her own natural inclination. He pointed out that the Queen had on so many occasions displayed her natural repugnance to marriage, "which convinced him that she would never conclude it, and he thought therefore that it would be better to excuse herself for the

¹²² Bernardino De Mendoza to the King, 27 January 1582, *CSP Spain*, III, 274; 9 February 1582, *CSP Spain*, III, 281; 1 March 1582, *CSP Spain*, III, 299.

¹²³ Bernardino De Mendoza to the King, 27 January 1582, *CSP Spain*, III, 274-75.

past offences she had committed towards the French, rather than exasperate them with new ones."¹²⁴

No matter what Elizabeth could promise either to her councillors or to Alençon, the marriage was too problematic for her to carry out after 1581 and finally faded away in June 1584 when Alençon died. The last chance for Elizabeth to marry was thus ended. She wrote to the Queen Mother to express her sorrow,

. . . although you his mother, yet there remain to you several other children. But for myself, I find no consolation if it be not death, which I hope will make us soon to meet. Madam, if you could see the image of my heart you would there see the picture of a body without a soul.¹²⁵

It was difficult to judge how sincere Elizabeth's letter was, but the failure of marriage was indeed a hard blow both to her own person and policy in the Netherlands. Her original attempt was to bring the Duke of Alençon under her command and use him as the instrument for bringing peace to the Low Countries and stability to western Europe, and simultaneously solve the problems of her marriage and succession. Yet on the one hand, the Duke was too earnestly involved in the wars in the Netherlands to bring any peace. On the other hand, Elizabeth herself was not able to formulate a powerful enough argument and strategy to fight with that of opponents. More so than her sister Mary, Elizabeth was short of guidance; her attitude was less stable and determined, persistently constrained by her councillors and committed Protestants. In another respect, Elizabeth was increasingly dissuaded from a foreign match by the public opinion after 1580. The foreign match of a ruling queen itself was still an

¹²⁴ Bernardino De Mendoza to the King, 19 March 1582, *CSP Spain*, III, 318.

¹²⁵ Elizabeth to Catherine De Medici, c. July 1584, Harrison, 162.

offensive theme to English people. Mary's precedent had showed how a ruling queen's insistence on going ahead with a foreign match would inflict lasting damage to her rule. Elizabeth eventually followed the will of her people (ironically her people had also wished her to marry someone), and observed her promise of motherly and princely care.

It signified again that the result of Elizabeth's unmarried life was not consciously chosen by herself, but to a large extent it was imposed on her by the writers and her councillors. Indeed, there was no evidence in the whole course of Elizabeth's courtships to conclude that she was determined from the beginning of her reign to spurn the possibility of marriage, even though she cunningly made use of the value of courtship to advance political interests. The outcome of her marriage was not the result of, as some historians have suggested, her precocious awareness of feminism, nor her perpetual vow of celibacy. Instead, Elizabeth's single life was a result of practical difficulties: the Catholic belief of the prospective husbands threatened England's religious settlement; the divided opinions among the councillors brought the two parties in the court. Moreover, in respect of the debate on the Queen's marriage, the notion of husband/wife relationship, which suggested that a foreign husband would injure English female ruler's political autonomy, thwarted further the possibility of marriage.

The final result of Elizabeth's matrimonial negotiations, in a sense, was better for her, personally and politically. Now she could portray herself as a real Virgin Queen, an icon to the ideal of chastity, without encountering the political crisis

caused by marriage—had as Mary I and Mary Queen of Scots. To be precise, it was in 1579, when there was great expectation of Elizabeth's marriage to a French prince, that the cult of Elizabeth's chastity emerged, taking its root after the failure of this courtship. Some scholars, like Roy Strong, have chosen to see the representation of Elizabeth as the Virgin Queen as a sort of Protestant substitute for the cult of the Virgin Mary, filling a gap in the psyche of the masses. However, we may understand this better if we also see it as a political need, manipulated by Elizabeth's government and the writers to create a psychological symbol of England's national sentiment, focused around the patriotic cult of an unmarried queen, in order to unite the divided people in different religions. Being unmarried, and therefore under no submission to a husband, Elizabeth ruled alone and independently, giving her people the illusion that England stood independent of foreign intervention and even stood highly as an elected nation. This reflects the heightened awareness amongst English people of the identification of their Queen with the nation. Put in another way, her symbol of virginity could be transferred into a symbol of English national independence.

In conclusion, if we take the two English ruling queens' marriages together, both Mary and Elizabeth formulated their attitudes towards marriage along the same lines: they privately preferred virginity but accepted marriage as the princely duty. In many respects, Elizabeth imitated Mary's rhetoric, such as the analogy of England with the Queen's husband. However, Elizabeth was far less consistent and resolute

in her own marriage, resulting from the lack of united conciliar support and from the popular outcry against the foreign match. At this point, any assumption of viewing Elizabeth as a free woman in her age, manoeuvring the politics of her courtships with the modern consciousness of feminism, is ignoring the practical situation in that time.

This chapter therefore rejects the assumption that Elizabeth had a perpetual vow of celibacy from the start of her reign and that she had no true interest in marrying but only manipulated every courtship consciously and cunningly to reap political advantage from it. Instead, the year of 1579 can be seen as a turning point in which Elizabeth's Protestant subjects began to address the Queen and declare that chastity was a more valuable and beneficial state than marriage, and thereafter the Queen was increasingly imposed on to choose a single life and its associations with the Virgin Mary. In a word, Elizabeth's virginity was a point forced on her by her subjects, instead of a pre-installed plan in her mind.

It is noteworthy that English people's anxiety about the queen's inferior gender and England's freedom was consequential to the process of these two queen regnants' matrimonial negotiations. Although religion was an obvious theme in the Protestant propaganda against both queens' marriages, the popular disapproval of foreign matches primarily resulted from their distrust of the queen's wifely status in marriage and from the apprehension of foreign domination. The religious factor was almost irrelevant in the popular support of those uprisings in Mary's reign and it was only ostensible in Elizabeth's matrimonial negotiations. If a Protestant prince were available for Elizabeth, we could expect similar obstacles to those which she

experienced. This chapter, therefore, argues that Susan Doran has underestimated the function of Elizabeth's gender in frustrating the Queen's marriage.¹²⁶ Rather, the traditional conception of the husband's domination over the wife in the case of ruling queens' marriage was a more strident and powerful ground to oppose the foreign match than in that of kings' matrimony. Because of her sex, the ruling queen's marriage could prevalently induce and enhance people's concern for the freedom of a state, but usually the king's marriage took account only of religion, succession, diplomatic or dynastic interests.

The confrontation between these two Tudor queens and their opponents indeed led to the efficacious impact of the ruler's sex on the development of English national consciousness. Scholars have pointed out the emanation of English national consciousness, developing rapidly between 1550 and 1700, as a result of English Protestantism, especially as displayed by historical works written by John Foxe, Matthew Parker, William Camden, and so on.¹²⁷ Yet they do not pay enough attention to those tracts and pamphlet, such as *A Supplicactyon to the Quenes Majestie*, *A Warnyng for Englande*, John Stubbs's *Gaping Gulf* and Philip Sidney's letter, in which a sense of nationhood was associated with the queens' marriage. In a country governed by a female ruler, those writers indicated the pessimism that the English people faced, that they would share the same fate as the queen—the loss of

¹²⁶ Doran, *Monarchy and Matrimony*, 215 and her "Why Did Elizabeth Not Marry?" 49-50.

¹²⁷ See John Pocock, "England," in *National Consciousness, History, and Political Culture in Early-Modern Europe*, ed. Orest Ranum (Baltimore: the Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975), 98-117; F. Smith Fussner, *The Historical Revolution: English Historical Writing and Thought, 1580-1640* (London: Routledge and Kegan Pauk, 1962); William Haller, "The Elect Nation," in his *Foxe's Book of Martyrs and the Elect Nation* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1963), 224-50.

independence—should the queen marry a foreign prince. The ideas of a free state and a sense of national independence consequently emerged as powerful weapons against the queen's foreign match. The experiences of both Mary Tudor and Elizabeth Tudor had demonstrated that popular discontentment against a foreign match was too explosive to ignore or defuse.

Conclusion

This thesis has pursued three issues which represented three notable and critical controversies during the reigns of Mary I and Elizabeth I, the first two English queen regnants. It argues that many tensions and difficulties provoked by the reign of the first female monarch, Mary, continued to confront the next queen regnant, despite the obvious disjunction of their religion. First, they both encountered conflict between traditional female qualities and rulers' heroic virtues while they were cultivating appropriate queenly virtues and images. Second, they came to the throne amid the same disputes about the righteousness of female rule. Third, they all faced internal criticism and division during their matrimonial negotiations. Therefore, historians should pay more attention to this continuity and similarity between these two queens. Furthermore, this thesis argues for a greater recognition of Mary's influence on Elizabeth's self-fashioning. Mary's precedent to a great extent inspired Elizabeth in styling her own rule and image, either learning from Mary's strategies or searching beyond their limitations. In this respect, the reign of Elizabeth cannot be viewed as new and unique. Instead, the questions we should ask are what Elizabeth learned from her sister and what differentiated means of self-fashioning Elizabeth developed from her sister.

Regarding the ruling queen's cultivation of a virtuous image, Mary was successful before her marriage in improving her womanly virtues, chastity in particular, associating herself with the Virgin Mary. She at that time even

developed a sort of public and powerful persona by creating an analogy of motherhood of all the English people. However, there came a significant change after her marriage. Mary then was keener to associate herself with the traditional female images of a submissive wife to King Philip and a tender mother to her expected child; she was largely confined to the private connotation of those roles, with little attention to her public image. Subsequently, Mary's unsuccessful childbirth in the summer of 1555 and the long absence of Philip were two heavy blows to Mary's image-making: she lost claim to all the celebrated images of virgin, mother and good wife. In many respects, Mary's cultivation of a womanly and religious image, such as the use of the analogy of the Virgin Mary, was no different from that of a queen consort, whose femininity functioned primarily to complement her husband's masculine qualities. Moreover, Mary's cultivation of queenly virtues was too centralised on the dimension of feminine qualities to achieve an ideal model of the ruling queen's virtues. This ideal model, as Chapter 1 indicates, must combine both femininity and masculinity.

As for Elizabeth, she followed Mary's self-fashioning to represent herself as a virgin, a wife and a mother; the Virgin Mary even became the most important icon of Elizabeth's representations. However, she consciously broke through Mary's limitations and employed these feminine roles persistently to build a public persona—the handmaiden of God, the dutiful wife and careful mother of all Englishmen—before and after she gave up the hope of marriage completely. In addition, she demonstrated innovation and intelligence on the issue of the cultivation

of queenly virtues. First, she made successful use of her rhetoric to construct double gender identities and fuse masculinity into her femininity. She thus was both a virgin and a man, a wife and a husband, a mother and father, a queen and a king. Secondly, she was more aware of cultivating the princely virtues to reinforce her masculine image, especially in and after the 1580s. Both in her public speeches and correspondence with James VI, the King of Scotland, Elizabeth demonstrated herself clearly to be the embodiment of the princely virtues and an experienced tutor of the king's craft. She even claimed herself to be the best Prince ever enjoyed by the English people.

Concerning the righteousness of the queen's rule, Mary's weakness lay in her inability to dissolve people's suspicion about a woman's fitness and capacity to rule, nor could she convey a strong image of a kingly ruler. She paid most attention to confirming her hereditary right as a legitimate heir to the English throne, and to establishing new institutions for the female monarchy. However, Mary's rule brought strident Protestant attack on the ground of her womanhood. Nevertheless, she was not able or willing to make any response but continued to concentrate on asserting her authority in legal terms. Once the Queen's succession right was legalised, her government attempted to uphold the Queen's authority by reviving the idea of absolute obedience, stressing that all power is ordained by God. Mary therefore expected the English people's obedience to her to equal that of a male king, regardless of her female sex; she even patronised James Cancellar and John Christopherson to teach people the duty of obedience and to reproach Protestant

political treason. In fact, the Protestant condemnation of female rule had less impact on Mary's image than Mary herself had. She rarely styled or referred to herself as a king or as a "sole quene," even though the Act of 1554 and Mary's marriage treaty both proclaimed that she enjoyed the same regal authority and royal power as preceding male kings, as "a sole quene" of England. After the marriage and during her pregnancy in particular, the strength of Mary's political supremacy faded out as Philip took precedence over Mary in their royal titles and gained the authority of regency for the future heir.

The next queen regnant, Elizabeth, basically followed Mary's strategy and chose not to respond directly to attacks on the abnormality of a woman's rule. However, she also learned from Mary's limitations and weaknesses. Elizabeth took her hereditary right for granted and displayed less and less concern about her legitimacy as her reign progressed. Furthermore, Elizabeth was tactful and conscious of defining her power through other sources. First, she not only proclaimed herself as God's instrument to realise his will, like Mary, but also argued that a "Bodye Politique to Gouverne" had added to her "Bodye naturallie" by God's permission, which manifested herself having two bodies, enabling her to be as competently as a male ruler.¹ Second, she accentuated the fact that her power was firmly grounded on the support and love of her people, emphasising the mutual love and good will between the Queen and her subjects. Elizabeth thus justified and sustained her royal

¹ Cited in Allison Heisch, "Queen Elizabeth I: Parliamentary Rhetoric and the Exercise of Power," *Sign 1-1* (1975): 33.

authority with a more profound and pervasive argument than Mary, confirmed from both above and below, with both divine and popular approval.

With respect to the question of the ruling queen's marriage, Mary's marriage also exerted significant influence on Elizabeth's matrimonial negotiations. First, Elizabeth followed Mary's language in formulating her attitude towards the problem of marriage. Both clearly expressed their natural and private disinclination to marriage, but simultaneously, they declared their willingness to marry, in order to fulfil the princely duty of producing an heir and the motherly care of public tranquillity. More obviously, Elizabeth imitated Mary's rhetoric to represent herself as the wife of England and hinted that she would not betray her wifely duty to her first husband—England—by marriage to a foreign husband. Secondly, Elizabeth was extremely careful with people's reactions and sought for full conciliar support, considering Mary's unpopular foreign match and the fact that there were several uprisings which resulted from Mary's insistence on her own will in opposition to the people's will. It is probably because of her extensive cautiousness that Elizabeth was never able to conclude a matrimonial alliance, even in the case of Alençon's courtship, in which she displayed tremendous affection towards the Duke, and expressed a desire to marry. Elizabeth was indeed impeded from marriage by practical difficulties: firstly, as Susan Doran suggests, her council never united behind any of her suitors;² secondly, the foreign match was continually unpopular in

² Susan Doran, "Why did Elizabeth Not Marry," in *Dissing Elizabeth: Negative Representations of Gloriana*, ed. Julia M. Walker (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1998), 30-59.

England, due to people's anxiety about the Queen's wifely status and foreign interference.

Mary and Elizabeth shared similar predicaments in the problem of marriage, and that both had difficulty in insisting on their personal inclination. One of the primary obstacles for a ruling queen's marriage lay in her gender. In both reigns, because the main candidates were foreigners, the queens' gender aroused a collective and pervasive apprehension that the consorts might take over the queens' authority and rule the country as they ruled the queens in marriage, or that England might be brought into submission to the consorts' native countries. The development of a sense of "free state," or national independence, during the English female monarchy mirrored popular dislike of the foreign match, a dislike which was too deep-rooted to dissolve. Ultimately, Mary's Spanish marriage, disregarding the opposition of her people, troubled her reign ceaselessly; but Elizabeth's destiny of virginity, though practically imposed by her subjects, granted her greater glorification as the Virgin Queen—an independent ruler.

Taken altogether, Queen Elizabeth was undoubtedly more skilful in manipulating rhetoric amid these controversies. She was also more conscious of the significance of self-fashioning. As demonstrated in the second section of Chapter 4 on her coronation entry, Elizabeth displayed a distinct sense of performance, deliberately involving herself in the activity of bestowing on her rule a beneficial significance; she proved to be the best actress upon that stage. Her reign manifested that England was a highly theatrical society, where royal appearance was a

performance calculated to arouse allegiance to the Queen.³ Regarding her self-identity as a ruling queen, Elizabeth also displayed keen awareness of her public personae—a sovereign, keeping a subtle distance from her private body of the female sex, but not denying this fact. Mary, on the contrary, was considerably confined within the role of a wife and was not successful in managing a balance between her private role and her public office.

The different performances of Mary and Elizabeth could be explained variously. Perhaps the first explanation that will come to most readers' mind is the fact that Mary was married while Elizabeth was not. Mary thus faced the paradox resulted from the conflict between her double roles of the Queen of England and the wife of the Spanish King, and also from the disparity between her husband's desire and the people's will. It was obviously a great challenge for a married queen regnant to produce a multi-functional "image" with a capability to compromise her different roles and to reconcile diverse opinions. Mary, under the paradox, ultimately chose to concentrate on her womanly virtues, especially those of a submissive wife. However, the reason that Mary was married and Elizabeth remained unwed should not be the decisive factor. Like Isabella of Castile, a married ruling queen could still develop a heroic and independent image, and could endeavour to sustain her political supremacy over her husband. In addition, she could make use of two Scriptural heroines, Deborah and Judith, both of whom were married women, to

³ For the idea of theatrical society, see Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning, from More to Shakespeare* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), 161-69.

symbolise her powerful governance, as the reigns of Queen Isabella and Elizabeth did. Indeed, as John King indicates, both Deborah and Judith embodied triumphal power traditionally relegated to kings; “they conform more closely to the traditional role of kings in government and war rather than the subordinate role of queens as mediators.”⁴ Hence, if Mary had earnestly employed these two biblical queens as her emblem for government, she would probably have been able to build a successful image of a ruler.

In fact, the difference between Mary’s self-fashioning and Elizabeth’s can be better explained by three reasons. First, their different performance, to a degree, was decided by their self-perceptions. Mary’s upbringing and education were primarily designed by the Spanish humanist, Vives, whose idea of the female sex and women’s education stressed predominantly women’s chastity and obedience. He viewed marriage as a woman’s final destination and emphasised wifely submission to her husband as her divine duty, denying women’s participation in the public sphere. Vives’s idea of a good woman, basically, fashioned Mary’s self-perception—viewing herself as a man’s helping hand rather than his head. Although Elizabeth was also educated under a humanist programme, she showed herself to be influenced less by Vives’s conservatism than by her training with Roger Ascham in classical readings from which she elicited the craft of rulership and political wisdom.

⁴ John N. King, “The Godly Women in Elizabethan Iconography,” *Renaissance Quarterly* 38 (1985): 58.

Second, it is significant that Elizabeth had the advantage of learning from the experience and mistakes of Mary, while the latter lacked a contemporary model to observe: the closest was her grandmother, Isabella of Castile, eighty years earlier, and in another country. However, we should not view Mary's reign merely as an inspiration to Elizabeth's reign; it had accomplished several devices which were crucial to the establishment of English female monarchy. Institutionally, Mary actively supported legislation regarding the queen's regal authority, which not only granted the queen royal power equivalent to male kings, but also bound the queen by traditional laws which bridled a ruler's liberty. Her marriage treaty confirmed further the political supremacy of a married queen regnant over her husband. Ritually, Mary's coronation ceremony and procession adopted the old rituals, which were used to sanctify male rulers, to be appropriate to female rulers. In a word, it was in the reign of Mary that the queen's rule was legalised and ritualised. Mary's achievement fundamentally benefited the next queen—Elizabeth, whose government could therefore legally wield power equivalent to that of a king. Furthermore, based on Mary's marriage treaty with Spain, Elizabeth's government could also persistently assert the Queen's predominance over her future husband in the process of her matrimonial negotiations.

Thirdly, Mary's short reign, only lasting five years, might also limit the possibility of Mary's effective performance in dealing with these controversies, in contrast with Elizabeth's forty-five-year rule. For instance, regarding the legitimacy of female rule, Mary only lived long enough to confirm her legitimacy through

validating her parents' marriage, and to establish the institution of the first female monarchy. However, during Elizabeth's long reign, she had plenty of time and opportunity to elaborate her gestures and speeches to justify the righteousness of her female rule substantially, not limited by the disputation of her legitimacy in terms of hereditary right. Furthermore, as her reign progressed, Elizabeth, whenever the opportunity arose, emphasised that her reign was peculiarly preserved by God and upheld by her subjects' love. Had Mary remained on the throne longer, she might have developed a more sophisticated art of self-fashioning to broaden and reinforce the foundation of her political power from various sources, as Elizabeth went on to do. Nevertheless, this is perhaps an unrealistic hypothesis; Mary had actually exhibited little awareness and capability of performance by the time of her coronation procession in 1553. However, an awareness of the significant difference in the length of reign is essential for historians to consider when judging the performances of these two queens.

Aside from the queens' performances, those writers who dedicated their "mirror-for-princesses" to these two queens or to the issues relating to the queen's rule also had great impact in fashioning the English queenship. These works were generally created in order to cope with the crises which sprang from the queen's rule, such as John Christopherson's *An Exhortation* written in 1554, which meant to sort out the danger of the rebellions and opposition to Mary's Spanish match and religious restoration, and John Aylmer's *An Harborowe for Faithfull and Trewe*

Svbiestes, written in 1559 at the start of Elizabeth's reign, intended to counterattack John Knox's revilement against female rule for the new Queen.

The extent of these writers' influence on the two queens was divergent, as was the relationship between these writers' ideas and the queens' own performance. They can be divided into three categories. First, some of the texts served as political propaganda to reinforce the queen's power and policy and therefore their discourses were usually addressed not only to the queen, but primarily to her subjects. They were generally inspired and sponsored by government and enjoyed a wide circulation in the realm. Moreover, these works closely mirrored the queens' own perception of their power and images.

Most of the Marian "mirror-for-princesses" belong to this group. Regarding Mary's virtues, such works as John Proctor's *The Waie Home to Christ* and Thomas Martin's *A Traictise*, embodied Mary's concentration on a pious image and female qualities, as Chapter 1 has shown. They glorified the Queen's godliness and virginity and associated her with the Virgin Mary, a perfect model of femininity. Similarly, the works of James Cancellar and John Christopherson, as examined in Chapter 3, accorded with Mary's determined assertion that her rule had confirmed by hereditary right and God's grace. They argued further that the Queen was elected and chosen by God to save England from heretics. The authors thus declared that rising against the Queen was tantamount to opposing God's will and was therefore unforgivable. Furthermore, they followed Mary's strategy of evading any problems caused by the Queen's gender, but stressed simply that all subjects needed to pay

absolute political obedience to the Queen, as to any higher power, in order to keep the divinely ordained social order. Again, concerning the controversy of Mary's Spanish match, two apologies written by Christopherson and John Proctor coincided with the Queen's own argument at almost every point, as Chapter 5 has indicated. They defended the Queen's freedom to determine her own matrimony and appealed to the subjects to be obedient to her choice. They justified the Spanish match further in terms of Philip's excellence in princely virtue and Spaniards' good will towards England; hence, they emphasised that the Queen's choice would bring comfort and tranquillity to the realm.

Among Elizabethan apologies, those sermons preached and printed for the annual celebrations of Elizabeth's Accession Day also fall into the first group. They not only reached a wider audience than Elizabethan courtly panegyric, but also impressively reflected Elizabeth's shift to the cultivation of a masculine image and qualities, different from the stereotype which attached Elizabeth to the Virgin Mary and eulogised her virginity. As Chapter 2 has demonstrated, the sermons likened the Queen to the first Christian Emperor, Constantine, and to Old Testament kings and prophets, such as David, Solomon, Josiah, Samuel, and Moses, in order to highlight her princely virtues of piety, justice, wisdom, constancy and magnificence. Furthermore, for them, the Queen's princely qualities were not only comparable with all ancient kings, but were also superior to all preceding English kings and to other contemporary European rulers. They, in accordance with the Queen's own confidence in her rule, viewed Elizabeth as the best Prince in the history of England.

On the whole, these works of the first group had close connections with the queens' own fashioning and also made a great contribution to the glorification of the queens' rule, representing queens as divine beings and their rule as divine providence. However, principally, these writers' interests lay in the promotion of their religion. It is notable that all the writers of this sort of "mirror-for-princesses" in the reign of Mary were zealous Catholics, and in the reign of Elizabeth, ardent defenders of the reformed English Church. They fashioned the queens deliberately and evidently into connection with the Church—identifying the queens with the Church. Therefore, the divine virtues of Queen Mary were a thing identical with the sanctity of the Church for her Catholic apologists and they built the symbol of maternity for both the Queen and the Church in order to command people's allegiance and natural love. Their final concern, after all, was to reinforce religious unity with the Roman Church. Likewise, the Protestant sermons for Queen Elizabeth also identified the Queen with the English Church, and more transparently exhorted the Queen to imitate the great and pious behaviour of those ancient kings and prophets to preserve true religion. Somehow, the relation between writer and queen was a sort of mutual reliance, and the apologists' interests depended precisely on a successful fashioning of the queen's authority and image.

The second group of "mirror-for-princesses" was composed of those works purporting primarily to justify the queen's political power, but with different presentation of the queen's rule from the queen's self-fashioning. They, therefore, gained little favour from the queen and seemed to have more influence on certain

groups of ministers, courtiers and scholars, than on the queen. Several defences for Elizabeth's political power, such as John Aylmer's *An Harborowe*, William Fleetwood's *Itinerarium ad Windsor*, and Henry Howard's *A Dutiful Defense*, belong to this group. As Chapter 4 has discussed, the starting point of their discourses was the argument that women's rule was not subversion of the natural order as John Knox declared, but a lawful regime in terms of natural law, divine law and civil law. Above all, they argued that there had been many women who wielded political power over men in history. However, these apologists were not writing pro-feminine humanist works, keen on elucidating the worth and superiority of the female sex, such as Thomas Elyot's *The Defence of Good Women* and H. C. Agrippa's *De nobilitate et praecellentia foeminei sexus*. Rather, they put great emphasis upon the law of nations, stressing that a princess could succeed to the crown when there lacked a male heir, according to English custom and laws. Aylmer initiated the use of lineal hereditary right as the legal basis of female rulership; his pragmatic resolution as well as his reinterpretation of Scripture (under the historical context of language and social situation) was drawn upon by later defenders of the queen's rule. It is significant that his method and argument cut across religious lines and was shared by Catholic apologists, like Howard.

The interests of Aylmer, Fleetwood and Howard lay in winning the Queen's favour and patronage. Yet, none of them won the Queen's preferment and none of their treatises was printed in England. Their bad fortune resulted on the one hand from the fact that they were viewed in connection with the conspiracy and

controversy of succession which agitated the Queen. On the other hand, their main argument was not appreciated by Queen Elizabeth. The Queen, unlike these theorists, was more inclined to situate herself above the debate of gynecocracy, manipulating her art of rhetoric to shape her political power upon the ground of God's providence and her subjects' desire. The Queen's way finally proved more effective in arousing a public affection towards the Queen. None the less, these writers made great contributions to the theoretical defence of woman's rule. In terms of political thought, in particular, they successfully counterattacked the traditional detraction of women in power, and reinterpreted Scripture and Roman civil law, in favour of the queen's rule. They balance the lack of theoretical justification for female rulership in the reign of the first English female monarch, for which Catholic apologists, surprisingly, did not produce any important works.

The third group of "mirror-for-queens," which were positioned in the forefront of opposition to the queens' policy, can be attributed to a category of "dissing the queen."⁵ This kind of disrespectful work emerged during the reigns of Mary and Elizabeth claiming to present popular opinion about certain issues, such as the queens' marriage. Those works, including *A Supplicacyon the Queenes Maiestie*, *A Warnyng for Englande*, and John Stubbs's *The Gaping Gulf*, usually utilised outrageous and provocative language and drew their argument from overt and vulgar documents. Most of the writers also attempted, secretly, to circulate their works as widely as they could. Although ostensibly addressed to the queen, they actually

⁵ See the introduction in Julia M. Walker ed., *Dissing Elizabeth*.

aimed to speak to the English people in order to sway public opinion. As in the case of Mary's marriage, Protestant pamphleteers manipulated English xenophobic prejudices and made use of the stories of Spanish rule in Naples, Milan and other domains to accentuate the Spaniards' perfidiousness and untrustworthiness. Although their opposition mostly resulted from religious anxiety, they intensified their objection to the Queen's marriage with the Prince of Spain by stirring national sentiment against foreign infiltration. They connected themselves closely with popular will, attempting to subdue the Queen's determination. Similar to this paradigm of opposition to the queen's foreign match, Stubbs's *The Gaping Gulf* manoeuvred Protestant prejudices about the Catholics and emphasised the cruelty and corruption of the royal house of France. Moreover, he provocatively declared that the marriage was a Papist conspiracy to take over England through the hands of France, fermenting a striking apprehension of French domination and the loss of England's independence.

This sort of work overtly indicated the disadvantage of the queens' gender in marriage and challenged the queens' authority in foreign and matrimonial policies. Certainly, these pamphleteers were detested by the queens; however, they prompted both queens to fashion an image which emphasised their willingness to listen to the people's voice and to submit themselves to the public good. Furthermore, those works were consequential at this point, in that they facilitated the identification of England (and even the Church) with the queens, by their attaching of the queens' autonomy from conjugal confinement to that of the independence of England.

Taken altogether, all of these three groups of “mirror-for-princesses” represented the course of comprehending and fashioning the queen’s rule in the later half of the sixteenth century. For them, the queen’s rule was not an intellectual game of debate, like *querelle des femmes* or early humanist answers to misogynistic charges, but a very real situation demanding new interpretation and image-making.⁶ Their participation in the practice of constructing the ruling queens’ authority and images assembled as a “mirror”—reflecting an image to imitate and pursue—for both Mary and Elizabeth. Nevertheless, while these writers fashioned exhortations and the significance of the queen’s rule according to their own interests and concerns, they were also endeavouring to echo and duplicate the queens’ self-fashioning. Therefore, the queens themselves also represented a form of “mirror”—illuminating the glorious actions of a female ruler—to be eulogised and confirmed by her apologists. That is to say, by means of their political power and patronage, the queens were actually involved in the same practice to reflect the significance of their rule to these writers. This interreaction between the writers and queens is crucial in understanding the formulation of English queen’s rule from 1553 to 1603.

The imagery of the mirror also applies in the connection between Isabella of Castile and Mary Tudor, and Mary and Elizabeth Tudor. In many respects, Isabella’s government served as a mirror for Mary. Mary imitated Queen Isabella’s pattern of joint rule and her cultivation of womanly virtues and a pious image,

⁶ For *querelles des femmes*, see Constance Jordan, *Renaissance Feminism: Literary Texts and Political Models* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990), 86-94.

although Mary was less successful, for she gave her people the impression of giving away regal authority to her husband. Likewise, Mary was a mirror for Queen Elizabeth, for the former exhibited the defects and difficulties of a ruling queen's image-making so that the latter could learn from them and refurbish the art of fashioning.

Considering the importance of the interreaction between the writers and the queens, and of the connection among these ruling queens, as mentioned above, this thesis has made threefold linkages which previous historians have not constructed: one between the theoretical defence of the queen's rule and the practical performances of the queens; another between the authors of "mirror-for-princesses" and Tudor female monarchs; and a third between each queen regnant, especially between Mary and Elizabeth. This thesis, which focuses on three critical issues regarding sixteenth-century English queen's rule, concludes that the associations between the writers and queens were various, depending on the topics, the authors' motivations and their ideas. Therefore, the fashioning of English queenship was not monolithic—either demanded by the queens or imposed by the writers—during the reigns of Mary and Elizabeth. Rather, it should be understood through the comparison between the writers' thoughts and the queens'. Furthermore, this thesis argues that Elizabeth's self-fashioning should be investigated in the context of Mary's queenship in which the basic controversies concerning the woman's rule had emerged and the preliminary strategies to cope with the challenges towards female

monarchy had established. That is to say, in terms of the queen's rule, the reigns of Mary and Elizabeth should be viewed as entity, as well as disparity.

Appendix

Printed Sermons of the Accession Day

(in chronological order)

1. Edwin Sandys, "A Sermon preached in York, at the celebration of the day of the Queen's entrance into her reign," in *Sermons Made by the Most Reuerende Edwin, archbishop of York*. London: H. Midleton, 1585, *STC* 21713; reprinted in *The Sermons of Edwin Sandys*, ed. John Ayre. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press for Parker Society, 1842, 55-74.
2. Edwin Sandys, "A Sermon preached in the same place, and upon the same occasion with the former," *ibid.*, 75-91.
3. John Whitgift, *A Most Godly and Learned Sermon, preached at Pauls Crose the 17 of Nouember, in the yeare of our Lorde 1583*. London: Thomas Orwin, 1589, *STC* 25432.
4. John Prime, *A Sermon Briefly Comparing the Estate of King Salomon and his Subiectes with Queen Elizabeth and her People, preached in sainet Maries in Oxford*. Oxford: J. Barnes, 1585, *STC* 20371.
5. Isaac Colfe, *A Sermon Preached on the Queenes Day, being the 17 of Nouember, 1587 at the twone of Lidd in Kent*. London: J. Wolfe, 1588, *STC* 5552.
6. John Prime, *The Consolations of Daud, Breefly Applied to Queene Elizabeth in a Sermon Preached in Oxford the 17 of Nouember 1588*. Oxford: J. Barnes, 1588, *STC* 20368.
7. Thomas White, *A Sermon Preached at Paules Crosse the 17 of Nouember 1589*. London: R. Robinson and Thomas Newman, 1589, *STC* 25407.
8. John King, *A Sermon Preached in Yorke the Seventeenth Day of November in the yeare of our Lord 1595, being the Queenes day*. Oxford: Joseph Barnes, 1597, *STC* 14976.
9. Thomas Holland, *Sermon Preached at Pavls in London the 17 of November Ann. Dom. 1599. . . wherevnto is adioyned an Apologeticall discourse, . . . for the observing the 17 of November yeerly in the forme of an holy-day*. Oxford: Joseph Barnes, 1601, *STC* 13597.

10. John Howson, *A Sermon Preached at St. Maries in Oxford in defence of the festivities of the Church of England, a[nd] namely that of her maiesties coronation*. Oxford: J. Barnes, 1602, *STC* 13884.

11. William Leigh, *Queen Elizabeth, Paraleld in her Princely Vertues with David, Iosua and Hezekia, in three sermons as they were preached three seuerall Queenes dayes*. London: T. C. for Arthur Johnson, 1612, *STC* 15426.
(The First Sermon: “with Daud her afflictions to build the Church.”)

12. (The Second Sermon: “paraled with Josua in her puissance to proctect the Church.”)

13. (The Third Sermon: with Hezekia in her “foure religious vertues.”)

Bibliography

Reference

- Baskerville, Edward J. *A Chronological Bibliography of Propaganda and Polemic published in English between 1553 and 1558*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1979.
- Pollard, Alfred W. and G. R. Redgrave, eds. *A Short-Title Catalogue of English Books Printed in England, Scotland, and Ireland, 1475-1640*. 3 vols. London, 1969.
- Stephen, L. and S. Lee, eds. *Dictionary of National Biography*. 21 vols., London, 1908-9.

Primary Sources

- A Warnyng for England, conteynyng the horribe practices of the Kyng of Spain in the Kingdom of Naples. [Showing] the plage that shall light yf [he] obteyne the dominion in England*. Strassburg: heirs of W. Köphel? 1555? STC 10023.7.
- A Supplicacyon to the Quenes Maiestie*. Strassburg: W. Rihel, 1555, STC 17562.
- Agrippa, Henricus Cornelius. *Declamation on the Nobility and Preeminence of the Female Sex*. Trans. and Ed. Albert Rabil. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1996.
- Ascham, Roger. *The Schoolmaster* (1570). Ed. Lawrence V. Ryan. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, published for the Folger Shakespeare Library, 1967.
- Aylmer, John. *An Harborowe for Faithfull and Treve Subjects against the Late Blown Blast*. London, 1559. STC 1005.
- Bacon, Francis. *The Works of Francis Bacon*, VI. Ed. James Spedding, Robert Leslie Ellis and Douglas Denon Heath. London: Longman, 1858.
- Becon, Thomas. *An Humble Supplicacion unto God, for the restoringe of hys holye woorde unto the churche of Englande* (Strasburgh, 1554, STC 1730). In *Prayers and Other Pieces of Thomas Becon*, Ed. John Ayre, 1884; reprint ed., Cambridge, 1968.
- Bently, Thomas. *The Monument of Matrones: conteining seuen seuerall Lamps of virginitie, or distinct treatises, . . .* London: H. Denham, 1582. STC 1829.
- Bertie, Richard. *Tract against John Knox's The First Blast of the Trumpet*. British Library, Additional MSS 48043.
- Bodin, Jean. *Six Books of the Commonwealth*. Trans. M. J. Tooley. Oxford: Blackwell, 1955.

- Bradford, John. *The Copy of a Letter, sent by John Bradforth to the Erles of Arundel, Darbie, Shrewsburye and Pembroke, declaring the narue of the Spaniards, and discouering treasons, againste Englande*. London: Wesel? Lambrecht?. 1556? (STC 3504.5); reprinted in John Strype, *Ecclesiastical memorials*. III, ii, 339-354.
- Bruce, John, ed. *Letters of Queen Elizabeth and King James VI of Scotland*. London: Camden Society 46, 1849.
- Burnet, G. *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England*, 3 vols. London: by T. H. for Richard Chiswell, 1681-1715.
- Bullinger, Henry. *A Confutatuon of the Popes Bull which was published more than two years agoe against Elizabeth the most gracious Queene of England, France and Ireland, and against the Noble realme of England, together with a defence of the sayd true Christian Queene*. London: John Day, 1572. STC 4044.
- Byrne, M. St Clare, ed. *The Letter of King Henry VIII, A Selection with a few other Documents*. London: Cassell and Company Ltd., 1936.
- Calendar of Letters, Despatches and State Papers relating to the negotiations between England and Spain preserved in the archives at Vienna, Simancas, Besançon and Brussels*, XI-XIII. Ed. Royal Tyler. London: HMSO, 1916-1954.
- Calendar of Letters, Despatches, and State Papers relating to English Affairs preserved principally in the Archives of Simancas*. 4 vols. Ed. Martin A. S. Hume. London: HMSO, 1892-1899.
- Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series of the Reigns of Mary I, 1553-1558, preserved in the Public Record Office*. Ed. C. S. Kington. London: Public Record Office, 1998.
- Calendar of State Papers, Foreign Series, of the Reign of Mary, 1553-1558, preserved in the Public Record Office*. Ed. W. B. Turnbull. London: Longman, 1861.
- Calendar of Sate Paper and Manuscripts Relating to English affairs existing in the archives and collections of Venice*, VI. Ed. Rawdon Brown. London: HMSO, 1864-1974.
- Calvin, John. *The Zurich Letters*, the second series. Ed. Hastings Robinson. Cambridge: the Parker Society 18, 1845.
- Camden, William. *Annales, or the Historie of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princess Elizabeth Late Queen of England*. Trans. R. Norton. London: B. Fisher, 1635. STC 4501.
- . *The Historie of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princess Elizabeth Late Queen of England*. Ed. Wallace T. MacCaffrey. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.
- Cancellar, James. *The Path of Obedience, righte necessarye for all the king and quenes maiesties louing subiectes*. London: J. Waylande, 1556? STC 4564.

- Cecil, William. *The Execution of Justice in England*. London, 1583; reprinted with William Allen's *A True, Sincere and Modest Defense of English Catholics*, in *Folger Documents of Tudor and Stuart Civilization*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, published for the Folger Shakespeare Library, 1965.
- Chamberlin, Frederick, ed. *The Sayings of Queen Elizabeth*. London: John Lane the Bodley Head Ltd., 1923.
- Christopherson, John. *An Exhortation to All menne to Take Hede and Beware of Rebellion*. London: J. Cawood, 1554. STC 5207.
- Colfe, Isaac. *A Sermon Preached on the Queenes Day, being the 17 of Nouember, 1587 at the twone of Lidd in Kent*. London: J. Wolfe, 1588. STC 5552.
- "The Coronation of Anne Boleyn." In E. Arber, *An English Garner, Tudor Tracts, 1532-1588*, XIII. London: Archibald Constable and Co., Ltd., 1877-96.
- Dekker, Thomas. *Old Fortunatus*, in *The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker*, I. Ed. Fredson Bowers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953.
- Elder, John. *The Copie of a Letter Sent into Scotland, of the ariuell and marryage of Philippe, prynce of Spaine to Marye quene of England*. London: J. Waylande, 1555. STC 7552. Reprinted in *The Chronicle of Queen Jane and of Two Years of Queen Mary*. Ed. John G. Nichols. London: Camden Society 48, 1850.
- Elyot, Thomas. *The Defence of Good Women*. Ed. Edwin Johnston Howard. Oxford, Ohio: the Ancher Press, 1940.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. *The Colloquies of Erasmus*. Trans. Craig R. Thompson. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.
- . *The Education of a Christian Prince*, in *Collected Works of Erasmus*, vol. 27. Trans. Neil M. Cheshire and Michael J. Heath. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986.
- . *Erasmus on Women*. Ed. Erika Rummel. Toronto: Toronto University Press, 1996.
- Fleetwood, William, *Itinerarium ad Windsor* (1575). British Library, Harley MSS 6234.
- Foxe, John. *Acts and Monuments*. London: John Day, 1563. STC 11222.
- . *Acts and Monuments*. London: Peter Short, 1596. STC 11226.
- . *Acts and Monuments*. 8 vols. Ed. George Townsend. New York: AMS Press, 1965.
- . "The Imprisonment of the Princess Elizabeth." In his *Acts and Monuments*. reprinted in E. Arber, *An English Garner, Tudor Tracts, 1532-1588*. vol. 13. 333-64. London: Archibald Constable and Co., Ltd., 1877-96.

- Frarius, Petrus. *An Oration against the Vnlaful Insurrections of the Protestantes of our time, vnderpretence to refourme Religion*. Trans. John Foulmer, Antwerp 1566. STC 11333.
- Gardiner, Stephen. *The Letters of Stephen Gardiner*. Ed. James Arthur Muller. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1970.
- Goodman, Christopher. *How Superior Powers ought to be Obeyd of their subjects, and wherein they may lawfully by Gods worde be disobdyed and resisted* (Geneva, 1558, STC 12020). Amsterdam: Theatrum Orbis Terrarum Ltd., 1972.
- Grafton, Richard. *An Abridgement of the Chronicles of England*. London: J. Waley, 1576. STC 12156.
- Harington, John. "Brief Notes and Remembrances," in *Nugae Antiquae: Being a Miscellaneous Collection of Original Papers in Prose and Verse Written during the Reigns of Henry VIII, Edward VI, Queen Mary, Elizabeth, and King James, I*. Ed. Henry Harington. London: Vernor and Hood, 1804.
- . *The Letters of Epigrams of Sir John Harington*. Ed. Norman E. McClure. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1930.
- Harrison, G. B., ed. *The Letters of Queen Elizabeth I*. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1968.
- Hartley, T. E., ed. *Proceedings in the Parliaments of Elizabeth I*. 3 vols. Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1981-1995.
- Hayward, John. *Annals of the First Four Years of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*. London: Camden Society, 1840.
- Heish, Allison, ed. *Queen Elizabeth I: Political Speeches and Parliamentary Address, 1558-1602*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1994.
- Heywood, Thomas. *Englands Elizabeth her life and troubles during her minoritie, from the cradle to the crowne*. (London: John Bale, 1631, STC 13313). Amsterdam: Theatrum Orbis Terrarum Ltd., 1973.
- Hoggarde, Miles. *The Displaying of the Protestantes, a[nd] sondry their practises, with a discription of diuers their abuses of late frequented*. London: R. Caly, 1556. STC 13557.
- Holland, Thomas. *Sermon Preached at Pavls in London the 17 of November Ann. Dom. 1599. . . wherevnto is adioyned an Apologeticall discourse, . . . for the observing the 17 of November yeerly in the forme of an Holy-day*. Oxford: Joseph Barnes, 1601. STC 13597.
- Holinshed, Raphael. *Chronicles of England Scotland and Ireland*. 6 vols. London: J. Johnson, 1807-1808.
- Howard, Lord Henry. *A Dutiful Defense of the Lawful Regiment of Women* (1590). Newberry Case MS, fJ5452.634, Chicago University; Houghton Library, Harvard, fMS. Eng.826; British Library, Lansdown MSS 813.

- Howson, John. *A Sermon Preached at St. Maries in Oxford in defence of the festivities of the Church of England, a[nd] namely that of her maiesties coronation*. Oxford: J. Barnes, 1602. STC 13884.
- Hughes, Paul L. and James F. Larkin, eds. *Tudor Royal Proclamations*. 3 vols. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964.
- King, John. *A Sermon Preached in Yorke the Seventeenth Day of November in the yeare of our Lord 1595, being the Queenes day*. Oxford: Joseph Barnes, 1597. STC 14976.
- Knox, John. *The Works of John Knox*, 6 vols. Edinburgh: James Thin, 1845; reprint, New York: AMS Press, 1966.
- Leigh, William. *Queen Elizabeth, Paraleld in her Princely Vertues with David, Iosua and Hezekia, in three sermons as they were preached three seuerall Queenes dayes*. London: T. C. for Arthur Johnson, 1612. STC 15426.
- Leslie, John. *A Defence of the Honour of Marie Quene of Scotlande*, London, 1569; reprinted in facsimile in *English Recusant Literature, 1558-1640*, 12. New York: Scholar Press, 1970.
- Luther, Martin. *Temporal Authority: to what Extent it Should be Obeyed*. Trans. J. J. Schindel. In *Luther's Works*, 45. Ed. Walther I Brandt. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1962.
- Lyly, John. *Euphues and his England* (1580) in *The Complete Works of John Lyly*, II, ed. R. Warwick Bond. Oxford: Clarendon, 1902.
- Machiavelli, Niccolò. *The Prince*. Trans. George Bull. Penguin Books, 1961.
- The manner of the Coronacion of the late Quene Mary*. British Library, Royal App. 89.
- Mansfield, Harvey C. Jr., *Machiavelli's Virtue*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.
- Martin, Thomas. *A Traictise Declaryng and Plainly Prouyng, that the pretended marriage of priestes, and professed persones is no mariage . . .* London: R. Caly, 1554. STC 17517.
- Morton, Thomas. *Salmon or a Treatise Declaring the State of the Kingdome of Israel, as it was in the daies of Salomon*. London: Robert Robinson, 1596. STC 18194.
- Mulcaster, Richard. *The Quenes Maiesties Passage through the Citie of London to Westminster the Daye before her Coronacion* (London: R. Tottel, 1559. STC 7589.5). Ed. James M. Osborn. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960.
- Munday, Anthony. *A Watch-woord to England to Beward of Traytours and Tretcherous Practises*. London: printed for Thomas Hacket, 1584. STC 18282.

- Nichols, John Gough, ed. *The Chronicle of Queen Jane and of Two Years of Queen Mary*. London: Camden Society 48, 1850.
- ed. *The Chronicle of the Grey Friars of London*. London: Camden Society 53, 1852.
- ed. *The Diary of Henry Machyn, Citizen and Merchant-Taylor of London*. London: Camden Society 42, 1848.
- Pears, Steuart A., ed. *The Correspondence of Sir Philip Sidney and Hubert Languet*. London: William Picering, 1845.
- Pizan, Christine de. *The Book of the City of Ladies*. Trans. Earl Jeffrey Richards. New York: Persea Books, 1982.
- Ponet, John. *A Short Treatise of Politike Power, and of the true obedience which subjectes owe to kynges and other civile governours* (Strasbourg: heirs of W. Köphel, 1556, STC 20178). Reprinted in Winthrop S. Hudson, *John Ponet (1516?-1556), Advocate of Limited Monarchy*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1942.
- Prime, John. *A Sermon Briefly Comparing the Estate of King Salomon and his Subiectes with Queen Elizabeth and her People, preached in sainet Maries in Oxford*. Oxford: J. Barnes, 1585. STC 20371.
- . *The Consolations of David, breefly applied to queene Elizabeth in a sermon preached in Oxford the 17 of Nouember 1588*. Oxford: J. Barnes, 1588. STC 20368.
- Proctor, John. *The History of Wyatt's Rebellion: With the Order and Manner of Resisting the Same* (London: R. Caly, 1554, STC 20407). Reprinted in E. Arber, *An English Garner, Tudor Tracts, 1532-1588*, XIII, London: Archibald Constable and Co., Ltd., 1877-96.
- . *The Waie Home to Christ and Truth written by Vincent of Lerins*. London: R. Caly, 1554. STC 24754.
- Rice, George P, ed. *The Public Speaking of Queen Elizabeth: Selection from her Official Addresses*. New York: AMS Press, 1966.
- Roger, Thomas. *A Golden Chaine, Taken out of the Psalmes of King David; also, the pretious pearles of King Salomon*. London: H. Denham, 1579. STC 21235.
- Salisbury Manuscripts*, II. London: HMSO, 1888.
- Sandys, Edwin. *Sermons Made by the Most Reuerende Edwin, archbishop of Yorke* (London: H. Midleton, 1585, STC 21713). Reprinted in *The Sermons of Edwin Sandys*, ed. John Ayre, 55-91. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press for Parker Society, 1842.
- Shakespeare, William. *Julius Caesar*. Ed. T. S. Dorsch. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., The Arden Shakespeare, 1955.

- . *King Henry VIII*. Ed. R. A. Foakes. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd.. The Arden Shakespeare, 1957.
- Sharp, C. *Memorials of the Rebellion of 1569*. London: J. B. Nichols and Son, 1840.
- Sidney, Philip. *A Discourse of Syr PH. S. to the Queenes Majesty Touching hir Mariage with Monsieur*. In *The Complete Works of Sir Philip Sidney*, III, The Defence of Poesie Political Discourse Correspondence Translation. Ed. Albert Feuillerat, 51-60. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1923.
- . *Miscellaneous Prose*. Eds. Katherine Duncan-Jones and Jan Van Dorsten. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973.
- Smith, Sir Thomas. *De Republica Anglorum: The maner of Gouvernement or Policie of the Realme of England* (1583). Amsterdam: Da Capo Press, 1970.
- . *Dialogue on the Queen's Marriage* (1562), printed in John Strype, *The Life of the Learned Sir Thomas Smith*, Appendix III, 184-259. Oxford, 1820.
- Statutes of the Realm*, Record Commission, London, 1910-28.
- Stow, John. *The chronicles of England, from Brute vnto this present year 1580*. London: H. Bynneman F., 1580. STC 2333.
- Strype, John. *Ecclesiastical Memorials, relating chiefly to religion and the reformation of it, and the emergencies of the church of England, under King Henry VIII, King Edward VI and Queen Mary I*. 3 vols. Oxford, 1822.
- . *Historical Collections of the Life and Acts of John Aylmer, Lord Bishop of London in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*. Oxford, 1821.
- . *The Life of the Learned Sir Thomas Smith*. Oxford, 1820.
- Stubbs, John. *The Discoverie of a Gaping Gulf whreinto England is like to be Swallowed by an other French Marriage* (1579). Ed. Lloyd E. Berry. Charlottesville: the University Press of Virginia for the Folger Shakespeare Library, 1968.
- Tyndale, William. *Obedience of a Christien Men* (Antwerp, 1528, STC 24446). Amsterdam: Theatrum Orbis Terrarum Ltd., 1977.
- Vives, Juan Luis. *The Instruction of a Christian Woman*. Trans. Richard Hyrde (1540). Peprinted in *Vives and the Renaissance Education of Women*. Ed. Foster Watson. London: Edward Arnold, 1912.
- White, Thomas. *A Sermon Preached at Paules Crosse the 17 of Nouember 1589*. London: R. Robinson and Thomas Newman, 1589. STC 25407.
- Whitgift, John. *A Most Godly and Learned Sermon, preached at Pauls Crosse the 17 of Nouember, in the yeare of our Lorde 1583*. London: Thomas Orwin, 1589. STC 25432.
- Wingfield, Robert. "The *Vita Mariae Angliae Reginae* of Robert Wingfiel of Brantham." In *Camden Miscellany*, 28. Trans. Diarmaid MacCulloch. London: the Royal Historical Society, 1984.

Wriothesley, Charles. *A Chronicle of England During the Reigns of the Tudors from 1485 to 1559*. 2 vols. Ed. W. D. Hamilton. London: Camden Society 20, 1877.

Secondary Sources

- Adams, Simon. "Eliza Enthroned? The Court and Its Politics." In *The Reign of Elizabeth I*. Ed. Christopher Haigh, 55-77. London: Macmillan, 1984.
- . "Faction, Clientage, and Party: English Politics, 1550-1603." *History Today* 32 (1982): 33-39.
- . "Favourites and Factions at the Elizabethan Court." In *Princes, Patronage, and the Nobility: The Court at the Beginning of the Modern Age*. Eds. Ronald G. Asch and Adolf M. Burke, 265-87. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Alsop, J. D. "The Act for the Queen's Regal Power, 1554." *Parliamentary History* 13-3 (1994): 261-76.
- Anglo, Sydney. *Spectacle, Pageantry, and Early Tudor Policy*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969.
- . "The London Pageants for the Reception of Katherine of Aragon: November 1501." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 26 (1963): 53-89.
- Axton, Marie. *The Queen's Two Bodies: Drama and the Elizabethan Succession*. London: Royal Historical Society, 1977.
- Bainton, Roland H. "The Role of Noblewomen in the French Reformation." *Archive for Reformation History* 63 (1972): 168-94.
- Barbant, Margaret ed. *Politics, Gender & Genre: The Political Thought of Christine De Pizan*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1992.
- Bassnett, Susan. *Elizabeth I: A Feminist Perspective*. Oxford: St. Martin's Press, 1988.
- Bell, Ilona. "Elizabeth I: Always Her Own Free Woman." In *Political Rhetoric, Power, and Renaissance Women*. Eds. Carole Levin and Patricia A. Sullivan, 57-82. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995.
- . "'Souereaigne Lord of lordly Lady of this land': Elizabeth, Stubbs, and the Gaping Gvlf." In *Dissing Elizabeth: Negative Representations of Gloriana*. Ed Julia M. Walker, 99-117. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1998.
- Bell, Susan Groag. "Christine de Pizan (1364-1430): humanism and the problem of a studious woman." *Feminist Studies* 3 (1976): 173-84.
- Benson, Pamela Joseph. *The Invention of the Renaissance Woman: the Challenge of Female Independence in the Literature and Thought of Italy and England*. Pennsylvania: the Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992.
- Bloch Marc. *The Royal Touch: Monarchy and Miracles in France and England*. Trans. J. E. Anderson. New York: Dorset Press, 1961.

- Bock, Gisela. "Women's History and Gender History: Aspects of an International Debate." *Gender and History* 1-1 (1989): 7-30.
- Bossy, John. *The English Catholic Community 1570-1850*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1975.
- Brown, P. H. *George Buchanan*. Edinburgh: David Douglas, 1980.
- Brown-Grant, Rosalind. *Christine de Pizan and the Moral Defence of Women: Reading beyond Gender*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Bruce, John. "Particulars Respecting Thomas Sackville, Lord Buckhurst, with a Fragment of the '*Itinerarium ad Winsor*.' Written by Mr. Serjeant Fleetwood, Recorder of London." *Archaeologia* 37 (1856): 351-62.
- Burckhardt, Jacob. *The Civilisation of the Renaissance in Italy*. Trans. S. G. C. Millemore. London: C. K. Paul, 1878.
- Burke, Peter. *The Fortunes of the Courtier: the European Reception Castiglione's Cortegiano*. Cambridge: Polity, 1995.
- . *The Historical Anthropology of Early Modern Italy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- . "Representations of the Self from Petrarch to Descartes." In *Rewriting the Self: Histories from the Renaissance to the Present*. Ed. Roy Porter. London: Routledge, 1997.
- Burns, J. H. *The True Law of Kingship: Concepts of Monarchy in Early-Modern Scotland*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- Campbell, Lily B. *Tudor Conceptions of History and Tragedy in "A Mirrore For Magistrates"*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1936.
- Carlson, Edgar. "Luther's Conception of Government." *Church History*, 15 (1946): 257-70.
- Carroll, Warren Hasty. *Isabel of Spain: the Catholic Queen*. New York: Christendom Press, 1991.
- Chamberlayne, Joanna L. "Crowns and Virgins: Queenmaking during the wars of the Roses." In *Young Medieval Women*. Eds. Katherine J. Lewis, Noël James Menuge and Kim M. Philips, 47-68. Gloucestershire: Sutton Publishing, 1999.
- Chibnall, Marjorie. *The Empress Matilda, Consort, Queen Mother and Lady of the English*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1991.
- Collinson, Patrick. "A Chosen People? The English Church and the Reformation." *History Today* 36 (1986): 14-20.
- . "The Elizabethan Church and the New Religion." In *The Reign of Elizabeth I*. Ed. Christopher Haigh, 169-94. London, Macmillan, 1984.
- . *Elizabethan Essays*. London: The Hambledon Press, 1994.
- . *The Religion of Protestants: the Church in English Society 1559-1625*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.

- Cogswell, Thomas. "England and the Spanish Match." In *Conflicts in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religions and Politics, 1603-1642*. Eds. Richard Cust and Ann Hughes, 107-33. Harlow Essex: Longman, 1989.
- Crawford, Patricia. *Women and Religion in England 1500-1720*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Cressy, David. *Bonfires and Bells: National Memory and the Protestant Calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1989.
- Cross, Claire. *The Royal Supremacy in the Elizabethan Church*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1969.
- Dickens, A. G. *The English Reformation*. 2nd., London: Batsford Ltd., 1989.
- Doran, Susan. *Elizabeth I and Religion 1558-1603*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- . "Juno Versus Diana: The Treatment of Elizabeth I's Marriage in Plays and Entertainments, 1561-1581." *The Historical Journal* 38 (1995): 257-74.
- . *Monarchy and Matrimony: The Courtship of Elizabeth I*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- . "Religion and Politics at the Court of Elizabeth I: the Habsburg Marriage Negotiations, 1559-1567." *English Historical Review* 104 (1989): 908-26.
- . "Why Did Elizabeth Not Marry?" In *Dissing Elizabeth: Negative Representation of Gloriana*. Ed. Julia M. Walker, 30-59. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1998.
- Dowling, Maria. *Humanism in the Age of Henry VIII*. London: Croom Helm, 1986.
- . "Humanist Support for Katherine of Aragon." *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 57 (1984): 46-55.
- . "A Women's Place? Learning and the Wives of Henry VIII." *History Today* 41(1991): 38-44.
- Dunham, W. H. "Regal Power and the Rule of Law." *Journal of British Studies* 3-2 (1963-4): 24-56.
- Elton, G. R. *England under the Tudors*. London: Methuen, 1974.
- . *Policy and Police: the Enforcement of the Reformation in the Age of Thomas Cromwell*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.
- . *Reform and Reformation*. London: Arnold, 1977.
- Fernández-Armesto, Felipe. *Ferdinand and Isabella*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1975.
- Ffolliott, Sheila. "Catherine de' Medici as Artemisia: Figuring the Powerful Widow." In *Rewriting the Renaissance: the Discourse of Sexual Difference in Early Modern Europe*. Eds. Margaret W. Ferguson, Maureen Quilligan and Nancy J. Vickers, 227-41. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.
- Fletcher, Anthony and Diarmaid MacCulloch. *Tudor Rebellions*. London: Longman, 1997.

- Fry, Susan. *Elizabeth I: The Competition for Representation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- . "The Myth of Elizabeth at Tilbury." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 23-1 (1992): 95-114.
- Garrett, Christina Hallowell. *The Marian Exiles: A Study in the Origins of Elizabethan Puritanism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938.
- Greaves, Richard L. "Concepts of Political Obedience in Late Tudor England: Conflicting Perspectives." *Journal of British Studies* 22 (1982): 23-34.
- Green, Janet M. "'I My Self': Queen Elizabeth I's Oration at Tilbury Camp." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 28-2 (1997): 421-45.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning from More to Shakespeare*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Guy, John. "The Elizabethan Establishment and the Ecclesiastical Polity." In *The Reign of Elizabeth I: Court and Culture in the Last Decade*. Ed. John Guy. 126-49. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- . *Tudor England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Hackett, Helen. *Virgin Mother, Maiden Queen: Elizabeth I and the Cult of the Virgin Mary*. London: Macmillan Press, 1995.
- Haigh, Christopher. *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society under the Tudors*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.
- . *Elizabeth I*. London: Longman, 1988.
- , ed. *The Reign of Elizabeth I*. London: Macmillan, 1984.
- Haller, William. *Foxe's Book of Martyrs and the Elect Nation*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1963.
- Hanning, Robert W. and David Rosand eds. *Castiglione: The Ideal and the Real in Renaissance Culture*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983.
- Harbison, E. Harris. *Rival Ambassadors at the Court of Queen Mary*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1940.
- Harris, Barbara J. "Women and Politics in Early Tudor England." *The Historical Journal* 33-2 (1990): 259-81.
- Haugaard, William P. *Elizabeth and the English Reformation: the Struggle for a Stable Settlement of Religion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.
- . "Elizabeth Tudor's *Book of Devotions*: a Neglected Clue to the Queen's Life and Character." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 22-2 (1981): 79-105.
- . "Katherine Parr: the Religious Convictions of a Renaissance Queen." *Renaissance Quarterly* 22 (1969): 346-59.
- Heish, Allison. *The Parliamentary Addresses of Queen Elizabeth I*. PhD. Dissertation, Harvard University, 1977.
- . "Queen Elizabeth I: Parliamentary Rhetoric and the Exercise of Power." *Sign* 1-1 (1975): 31-55.

- Hopkins, Lisa. *Women Who Would be Kings: Female Rulers of the Sixteenth Century*. London, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991.
- Hudson, Winthrop S. *John Ponet (1516?-1556), Advocate of Limited Monarchy*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1942.
- Janelle, Pierre, ed. *Obedience in Church and State: Three Political Tracts by Stephen Gardiner*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1930.
- Jardine, Lisa. *Still Harping on Daughters: Women and Drama in the Age of Shakespeare*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester, 1983.
- Johnson, Paul. *Elizabeth I: A Study in Power and Intellect*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1974.
- Norman Jones, *The Birth of the Elizabethan Age: England in the 1560s*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1993.
- Jordan, Contance. "Feminism and the Humanists: the Case of Sir Thomas Elyot's Defence of Good Women." In *Rewriting the Renaissance: the Discourse of Sexual Difference in Early Modern Europe*. Eds. Margaret W. Ferguson, Maureen Quilligan and Nancy J. Vickers, 242-58. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.
- . *Renaissance Feminism: Literary Texts and Political Models*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990.
- . "Woman's Rule in Sixteenth-Century British Political Thought." *Renaissance Quarterly* 40 (1987): 421-51.
- Kantorowicz, Ernst H. *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957.
- Kelley, H. A. *The Matrimonial Trial of Henry VIII*. California: Stanford University Press, 1976.
- Kelso, Ruth. *Doctrine for the Lady of the Renaissance*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1956.
- Kempton, Deniel. "Christine de Pizan's *Cité des Dames* and *Trésor de la Cité: Toward a Feminist Scriptural Practice*." In *Political Rhetoric, Power, and Renaissance Women*. Eds. Carole Levin and Patricia A. Sullivan, 15-37. Albany: State University of New York, 1995.
- Kettering, Sharon. "The Patronage Power of Early Modern French Noblewomen." *The Historical Journal* 32-4 (1989): 817-41.
- King, John N. "The Godly Woman in Elizabethan Iconography." *Renaissance Quarterly* 38 (1985): 41-84.
- . "Patronage and Piety: The Influence of Catherine Parr." In *Silent But for the Words: Tudor Women as Patrons, Translators, and Writers of Religious Works*. Ed. Margaret Patterson Hannay, 43-60. Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1985.
- . "Queen Elizabeth I: Representations of the Virgin Queen." *Renaissance Quarterly* 43 (1990): 30-74.

- . *Tudor Royal Iconography: Literature and Art in an Age of Religious Crisis*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989.
- Kolsky, Stephen. "Making and Breaking the Rules: Castiglione's *Cortegiano*." *Renaissance Studies* 11-4 (1997): 358-80.
- Lee, Patricia-Ann. "A Bodye Politique to Gouverne: Aylmer, Knox and the Debate on Queenship." *The Historian, A Journal of History* 52 (1990): 242-61.
- Lehmberg, Stanford E. *Sir Thomas Elyot: Tudor Humanist*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1960.
- Levin, Carole. "Advice on Women's Behavior in Three Tudor Homilies." *International Journal of Women's Studies* 6-2 (1983): 176-85.
- . *The Heart and Stomach of a King: Elizabeth I and the Politics of Sex And Power*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994.
- . "John Foxe and the Responsibilities of Queenship." In *Women in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance: Literary and Historical Perspectives*. Ed. Mary Beth Rose, 113-33. New York: Syracuse University Press, 1986.
- . "Lady Jane Grey: Protestant Queen and Martyr." In *Silent But for the Words: Tudor Women as Patrons, Translators, and Writers of Religious Works*. Ed. Margaret Patterson Hannay, 92-105. Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1985.
- . "Queens and Claimants: Political Insecurity in Sixteenth-Century England." In *Gender, Ideology and Action: Historical Perspectives on Women's Public Lives*. Ed. Janet Sharistanian, 41-66. New York, 1986.
- Levine, Mortimer. *The Early Elizabethan Succession Question 1558-1568*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1966.
- . "The Place of Women in Tudor Government." In *Tudor Rule and Revolution: Essays for G. R. Elton from his American friends*. Eds. Delloyd J. Guth and John W. Mekkenna, 109-23. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- . *Tudor Dynastic Problems 1460-1571*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd. 1973.
- Liss, Peggy K. *Isabel the Queen: Life and Times*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Loades, David. "The Authorship and Publication of *The Cope of a letter sent by John Bradforth to the Right honorable Lordes The Erles of Arundel, Darbie, Shrewsbury and Penbroke* (S.T.C. 3480)." *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 3 (1960): 155-60.
- . *Mary Tudor: A Life*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989.
- . "Philip II and the Government of England." In *Law and Government under the Tudors, Essays Presented to Sir Geoffrey Elton on His Retirement*. Eds. Claire Cross, David Loades and J. J. Scarisbrick, 177-94. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.
- . *The Reign of Mary Tudor: Politics, Government, and Religion in England, 1553-1558*. London: Ernest Benn Ltd., 1979.
- . *Two Tudor Conspiracies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1965.

- Loach, Jennifer. "The Function of Ceremonial in the Reign of Henry VIII." *Past and Present* 142 (1994): 43-68.
- . "The Marian Establish and the Printing Press." *English Historical Review* 101 (1986): 135-48.
- . "Pamphlets and Politics, 1553-8." *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 48 (1975): 31-44.
- . *Parliament and the Crown in the Reign of Mary Tudor*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Lorch, Maristella. "Petrarch, Cicero, and the Classical Pagan Tradition." In *Renaissance Humanism: Foundation, Forms, and Legacy*, I. Ed. Albert Rabil, 71-94. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988.
- Lunenfeld, Marvin. "Isabella I of Castile and the Company of Women in Power." *Historical Reflections* 4-2 (1977): 207-29.
- MacCaffrey, Wallace T. "The Anjou Match and the Making of Elizabethan Foreign Policy." In *The English Commonwealth 1547-1640: Essays in Politics and Society Presented to Joel Hurstfield*. Eds. Peter Clark, Alan G. R. Smith and Nicholas Tyacke, 59-75. Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1979.
- . *Elizabeth I*. London: Edward Arnold, 1993.
- . *Queen Elizabeth and the Making of Policy, 1572-1588*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1981.
- . *The Shaping of the Elizabethan Regime*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1968.
- Maclean, Ian. *The Renaissance Notion of Woman: A Study in the Fortunes of Scholasticism and Medical Science in European Intellectual Life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.
- Maltby, William S. *The Black Legend in England: The Development of Anti-Spanish Sentiment, 1558-1660*. Durham, NC.: Duke University Press, 1971.
- Marshall, Rosalind K. *Mary I*. London: HMSO, published in association with the National Portrait Gallery, 1993.
- Martienssen, Anthony. *Queen Katherine Parr*. London: Cardinal, 1975.
- Mattingly, Garrett. *Catherine of Aragon*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1942.
- McCartney, Elizabeth. "The King's Mother and Royal Prerogative in Early-Sixteenth-Century France." In *Medieval Queenship*. Ed. John Carmi Parsons, 117-41. London: Alan Sutton, 1994.
- McClure, Peter, and Robins Headlam Wells. "Elizabeth I as a second Virgin Mary." *Renaissance Studies* 4-1 (1990): 38-70.
- McConica, James Kelsey. "The Last Years of the Reign: the Role of Catherine Parr." In his *English Humanists and Reformation Politics under Henry VIII and Edward VI*, 200-34. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.
- McFarlane, I. D. *Buchanan*. London: Duckworth, 1981.
- Montrose, Louis. "The Elizabethan Subject and the Spenserian Text." In *Literary Theory / Renaissance Texts*. Eds. Patricia Parker and David Quint, 303-40. Baltimore: the Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986.

- Moore, Dennis. "Dutifully Defending Elizabeth: Lord Henry Howard and the Question of Queenship." In *Political Rhetoric, Power and Renaissance Woman*. Ed. Carole Levin and Patricia A. Sullivan, 113-36. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995.
- . "Recorder Fleetwood and the Tudor Queenship Controversy." In *Ambiguous Realities: Women in the Middle Ages and Renaissance*. Eds. Carole Levin and Jeanie Watson, 235-51. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1987.
- Muller, James A. *Stephen Gardiner and the Tudor Reaction*. London: S.P.C.K., 1926.
- Muller, Janel. "A Tudor Queen Finds Voice: Katherine Parr's Lamentation of a Sinner." In *Historical Renaissance: New Essays on Tudor and Stuart Literature and Culture*. Eds. Heather Dubrow and Richard Strier, 15-47. Chicago: the University of Chicago Press 1988.
- Nauert, Charles Garfield. *Agrippa and the Crisis of Renaissance Thought*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1965.
- Neale, J. E. *Elizabeth I and Her Parliaments, 1559-1581*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1953.
- . *Queen Elizabeth*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1938.
- . *Essays in Elizabethan History*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1958.
- Newman, Barbare. "Renaissance Feminism and Esoteric Theology: the Case of Cornelius Agrippa." *Viator: Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 24(1993): 337-56.
- Orlin, Lena Cowen. "The Fictional Families of Elizabeth I." In *Political Rhetoric, Power and Renaissance Women*. Eds. Carole Levin and Patricia A. Sullivan, 85-110. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996.
- Paul, John E. *Catherine of Aragon and Her Friends*. New York: Fordham University Press, 1966.
- Peardon, Barbara. "The Politics of Polemic: John Ponet's *Short Treatise of Politic Power* and Contemporary Circumstance 1553-1556." *Journal of British Studies* 22 (1982): 23-34.
- Peck, Linda Levy. *Northampton: Patronage and Policy at the Court of James I*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1982.
- Phillips, James Emerson. *Images of a Queen: Mary Stuart in Sixteenth Century Literature*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1964.
- Pill, David. *The English Reformation, 1529-58*. London: University of London Press, 1973.
- Pidal, Ramón Menéndez. "The Catholic Kings According to Machiavelli and Castiglione." In *Spain in the Fifteenth Century, 1369-1516: essays and*

- extracts by historians of Spain*. Ed. Roger Highfield, 405-25. London: Macmillan, 1972.
- . "The Significance of the Reign of Isabella the Catholic, According to her Contemporaries." In *Spain in the Fifteenth Century, 1369-1516: essays and extracts by historians of Spain*. Ed. Roger Highfield, 380-404. London: Macmillan, 1972.
- Plowden, Alison. *Marriage with my Kingdom: The Courtships of Queen Elizabeth I*. London: Book Club Associates, 1977.
- . *Two Queens in One Isle: the Deadly Relationship of Elizabeth I and Mary, Queen of Scots*. Sussex: the Harvester Press, 1984.
- Pocock, John. "England." In *National Consciousness, History, and Political Culture in Early-Modern Europe*. Ed. Orest Ranum, 98-117. Baltimore: the Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975.
- Pollard, A. F. *The History of England from the Accession of Edward VI to the Death of Elizabeth (1547-1603)*. In the Political History of England, VI. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1910.
- Pollen, John Hungerfore. *The English Catholics in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth: A Study of their Politics, Civil Life and Government*. London: Longmans, 1920.
- Prescott, Anne Lake. "The Pearl of the Valois and Elizabeth I: Marguerite de Navarre's *Miroir* and Tudor England." In *Silent But for the Words: Tudor Women as Patrons, Translators and Writers of Religious Works*. Ed. Margaret P. Hannay, 61-91. Kent, Ohio.: Kent State University Press, 1985.
- Quillizan, Maureen. *The Allegory of Female Authority: Christine De Pizan's Cité Des Dames*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991.
- Raab, Felix. *The English Face of Machiavelli: a Changing Interpretation 1500-1700*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1964.
- Rabil, Albert. *Renaissance Humanism: Foundations, Forms and Legacy*. 3 vols. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988.
- Ramsay, G. D. "The Foreign Policy of Elizabeth I." In *The Reign of Elizabeth I*. Ed. Christopher Haigh. London: Macmillan, 1984.
- Redworth, Glyn. *In Defence of the Church Catholic: the Life of Stephen Gardiner*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990.
- Reese, Alan W. "Learning Virginitv: Erasmus' ideal of Christian Marriage." *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 57-3 (1995): 551-67.
- Rehorn, Wayne A. *Courtly Performances: Masking and Festivity in Castiglione's "Book of the Courtier"*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1978.
- Richards, Judith M. "Mary Tudor as 'Sole Quene'? Gendering Tudor Monarchy." *Historical Journal* 40-4 (1997): 895-924.
- . "'To Promote a Woman to Beare Rule': Talking of Queens in Mid-Tudor England." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 28-1(1997): 101-21.

- Rubin, Nancy. *Isabella of Castile: The First Renaissance Queen*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991.
- Ruding, R. *Annals of the Coinage of Great Britain and its Dependencies: from the Earliest Period of Authentic History to the Reign of Victoria*. 3 vols. London: J. Hearne, 1840.
- Russell, Conrad. *The Crisis of Parliaments: English History 1509-1660*. London: Oxford University Press, 1971.
- Sánchez, Magdalena S. *The Empress, the Queen, and the Nun, Women and Power at the Court of Philip III of Spain*. Baltimore: the Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.
- Scalingi, Paula Louise. "The Scepter or the Distaff: The Question of Female Sovereignty, 1516-1607." *The Historian* 41-1 (1978): 59-75.
- Schleiner, Winfried. "Divina virago: Queen Elizabeth as an Amazon." *Studies in Philology* 75 (1985): 163-80.
- Scott, Joan W. "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis." *American Historical Review* 91(1986): 1053-75.
- Shephard, Amanda. *Gender and Authority in Sixteenth-Century England*. Keele: Ryburn, 1994.
- . "Henry Howard and the Lawful Regiment of Women." *History of Political Thought* 12-4 (1991): 589-603.
- Skinner, Quentin. *The Foundation of Modern Political Thought*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.
- . *Liberty Before Liberalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- . *Machiavelli*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981.
- Smith, Alan, G. R. *The Emergence of a Nation State: the Commonwealth of England 1529-1660*. London: Longman, 1984.
- Smith, L. B. *Tudor Prelates and Politics 1536-1558*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953.
- Sowards, J. K. "Erasmus and the Education of Women." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 13-4 (1982): 77-89.
- Starkey, David. *The Reign of Henry VIII: Personalities and Politics*. Hampshire: George Philip, 1985.
- Strong, Roy. *Art and Power: Renaissance Festivals, 1450-1650*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1984.
- . *The Cult of Elizabeth: Elizabethan Portraiture and Pageantry*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1977.
- . *Gloriana: The Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I*. New York: Thames and Hudson, 1987.
- Thorp, Malcolm R. "Religion and the Wyatt Rebellion of 1554." *Church History* 47 (1978): 363-80.
- Tillyard, E. M. W. *The Elizabethan World Picture*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1943.

- Trevor-Roper, H. R. *George Buchanan and the Ancient Scottish Constitution*. English Historical Review, Supplement 3, 1966.
- Walker, Julia M. ed. *Dissing Elizabeth: Negative Representations of Gloriana*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1998.
- Warner, Marina. *Alone of All Her Sex: the Myth and Cult of the Virgin Mary*. London: Quarter Books, 1978.
- Warnicke, Retha M. *Women of the English Renaissance and Reformation*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1983.
- Wayne, Valerie. "Some Sad Sentence: Vives' Instruction of a Christian Women." In *Silent but for the Words: Tudor Women as Patrons Translators, and Writers of Religious Works*. Ed., Margaret P. Hannay, 15-29. Kent, Ohio.: Kent State University Press, 1985.
- Weil, Rachel. "'The Crown has Fallen to the Distaff': Gender and Politics in the Age of Catherine de Medici, 1560-1589." *Critical Matrix* 1-4 (1985): 9-38.
- Wiesner, Merry E. *Women and Gender in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Willard, Charity Cannon. *Christine de Pizan: Her Life and Works*. New York: Persea Books, 1984.
- Williams, Penry. *The Later Tudors, England 1547-1603*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Wilson, E. C. *England's Eliza*. Cambridge: Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1939.
- Woodbridge, Linda. *Women and the English Renaissance: Literature and the Nature of Womankind, 1540-1620*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1984.
- Woodhouse, J. R. *Baldesar Castiglione: a Reassessment of the Courtier*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1978.
- Woods, Susanne. "Spenser and the Problem of Women's Rule." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 48-2 (1985): 141-58.
- Woodward, Geoffrey. *Spain in the Reigns of Isabella and Ferdinand, 1474-1516*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1997.
- Wormald, Jenny. *Mary Queen of Scots: A Study in Failure*. London: Collins & Brown, 1991.
- Yates, Frances A. *Astraea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century*. London: Pimlico, 1975.
- . "Queen Elizabeth as Astraea," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 10 (1947): 27-82.
- Youngs, Frederic A. *The Proclamations of the Tudor Queens*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.